OTHER PUBLICATIONS—77

UPADHYE: PAPERS

Dr A N UPADHYE

1983

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This volume " Upadhye Papers " is a collection of some articles and introductions written by the late Dr A N Upadhye, Retired Professor of Jainology and Prakrit, University of Mysore, whose erudition is well-known to both Oriental and Occidental scholastic world

We are under a deep debt of gratitude to the late Professor Upadhye, who did not survive to see the present form He gave the Manuscript to the press and himself corrected some proofs too It is unfortunate, Death laid his harsh hands even before he could settle down in his house at Kolhapur after his retirement from the service of the University of Mysore After his demise, proofs have been seen by Dr T G Kalghatagi, Sri Shubhachandra and Sri Sitaram Jagirdar The heavy task of preparing index has been completely done by Sri Sitaram Jagirdar All this they have done as a token of affection and reverence to the late Professor Upadhye

We are also grateful to Messrs Wesley Press, Mysore for the excellent printing and to Dr H R Raghunatha Bhat for the cover design

K T Veerappa
Director

23-5-1983

CONTENTS

BṚHAT-KATHĀKOŚA*

[Ārādhanā Tales and Vaḍḍārādhane]

1 CRITICAL APPARATUS AND TEXT-CONSTITUTION

(i) Description of Mss and their Mutual Relation

This *editio princeps* of the Kathākośa of Hariṣeṇa is based on three Mss whose description is given below

Pa This paper Ms, written in Devanāgarī characters, belongs to the Deccan College Collection, now deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona It measures 12 7"×5 7", and bears the No 1159 of 1891-95 In all there are 350 folios written on both sides, the first and the last folio, however, are written on only one side The page No 267 is put twice There are twelve lines on a page, and about 50 *akṣaras* in a line Black ink is used for the body of the text, while the marginal lines, the Daṇḍas, the verse-numbers and the colophons are written in red ink On many pages the handwriting looks apparently different, but I think that the whole Ms is written by one and the same copyist It is well preserved The characters are neat and clear There are a few marginal notes giving the synonyms of some stray and unusual words occurring in the text The words to be spaced and the absorbed vowels are indicated by comma-like strokes and Avagraha-like marks respectively, and they are put on the head of the line A few corrections are made here and there with white paste, and some of them are quite sensible In many cases they agree with the actual readings of either Pha or Ja Scribal irregularities in numbering the verses and stories are seen in many places The Ms opens thus ॥ ६० ॥ ॐ नमो वीतरागाय ॥ The concluding portion runs thus इति श्री-हरिषेणाचार्य्यकृतं बृहत्कथाकोशं समाप्तं ॥ ग्रंथसख्या १२५००० ॥ श्रीरस्तु ॥ कल्याणमस्तु ॥ सवत् १८६८ का मासोतमासे जेठमासशुकपक्षचतुर्थ्यां तिथौ सूर्यवारे श्रीमूलसंघे नंद्याम्नाये बलात्कारगणे सरस्वतीगच्छे कुंदकुंदाचाऽर्यान्वये भट्टारकजी श्रीमहेंद्रकीर्तिजी तत्पट्टे भट्टारकजी श्रीक्षेमेंद्रकीर्तिजी तत्पट्टे भट्टारकजी श्रीसुरेंद्रकीर्तिजी तत्पट्टे भट्टारकशिरोमणिभट्टारकजी श्रीसुखेंद्रकीर्तिजी तदाम्नाये सवाईजयनगरे श्रीमन्नेमिनाथचैत्यालये गोधाख्यमंदिरे पंडितोत्तमपंडितजी श्रीसतोषरामजी तत्सिख्य पंडितवषतरामजी तच्छिष्य हरिवंशदासजी तत्सिष्य कृष्णचंद्रः तेषा मध्ये वषतरामकृष्णचद्राभ्यां ज्ञानावरणीकर्मक्षयार्थं बृहदाराधना-कथाकोशाख्यं ग्रंथं स्वशयेन लिषितं श्रोतृवक्तृजनानामिदं शास्त्रं मंगलं भवतु ॥ This colophon is copied as it is, without any material changes, and it shows that the copyist is writing Sanskrit with a good deal of Hindi influence

* This is the Introduction of the Bṛhatkathākośa of Hariṣeṇa It was published in the Singhi Jain Series No. 17, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavana, Bombay 1943

Pha: This is a paper Ms written in Devanāgarī characters, and belongs to the Deccan College Collection now deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona It measures 13.25"×6 5", and bears the No. 1049 of 1887-91 In all there rae 377 folios, and they are written on both sides excepting in the case of the first folio The Ms falls into two divisions 157 folios are written in one hand, and the subsequent folios (with the last three lines on p 157) are written in a different hand In the first part there are 13 lines on a page with 35 to 40 *akṣaras* in a line, and in the latter portion there are 12 lines on a page with some 45 *akṣaras* in a line Marginal lines, Daṇdas, numbers of verses, colophons and words like *yugmam* etc are written in red ink and the verses are in black ink The Ms is not well preserved it has suffered exposure to moisture, some leaves are clogged together, the surface of some pages is torn, and the edges of some folios are spoiled Here and there some repairs are effected by pasting paper and by attempting to reproduce the lost letters, but the readings so replaced are purely conjectural Some of the clogged pages could not be collated, but such pages are not many The damage is apparent more in the first 157 folios, the paper of which is comparatively inferior Scribal slips and irregularities are found in plenty in this Ms After the symbol of *bhale*, the Ms. opens thus· ॐ नमो विघ्नच्छिदे and the concluding portion runs thus इति श्रीहरिषेणाचार्य्यकृतं बृहत्कथाकोशं समाप्तं ॥ १२५०० ॥ श्री ॥ सवत् १८७७ का मासोत्तममासे आसाढसुकपक्षे तिथौ ५ भृगुवासरे लिप्यकृतं माहात्मा सभुराम सवाईजयपुरमध्ये लिषायंतं ।

Ja. It stands for the transcript (upto the end of the story No 55) of a Jaipur Ms kindly sent to me by my friend Pt Kamta Prasadaji of Aliganj Later on he arranged to send the Jaipur Ms itself (leaves 87 onwards) to me after procuring it through Pt Bhanwar Lal Shastri, Jaipur The Ms belongs to a private library in Jaipur I owe special thanks to Pt Bhanwar Lalaji but for whose kind offices it would not have been possible to get this Ms The portion of the Jaipur Ms received by me does not exhibit an uniform constitution Folios 87 to 122 are written in one hand wth the verse-numbers, *yugmam* etc , and colophons in red ink The appearance of these pages is comparatively old A square piece is left blank in the middle of the page There are some 13 lines on a page and about 45 *akṣaras* in a complete line For folios 123 to 318 new and thick paper is used, and the handwriting too is different and comparatively inferior in appearance Pages 183 etc , are numbered as 173 etc In this new portion, no square-like space is left blank in the centre of the page, the red ink is used only for the marginal lines, and some light reddish powder is applied to verse-numbers, words like *yugmam* and colophons There are about 14 lines on a page and some 37 letters in a line Division of words is indicated by short comma-like strokes put at the top of the line Absorbed vowels too are shown by a sign like the *avagraha* Scribal errors are covered by some white paste On the last page, No 318, the name of the work is written on the left margin as Bṛhad-ārādhanākathākośa After the 16th verse of the Praśasti, there is a number 12500, put between the lines which perhaps stands for the Granthāgra Then we have the colophon in red ink इति श्रीहरिषेणाचार्यकृतबृहत्काथाकोशं समाप्तं । The two letters *cārya* are covered with black ink possibly by a later copyist who did not like to acknowledge Hariṣeṇa as an Ācārya Then we have in black ink सवत् १८३३ का मासोत्तममासे प्रथमभाद्रपदमासकृष्णपक्षा-मावस्य तिथो श्री The rest of the writing, covering nearly six lines, has been rubbed with black ink, and the letters can be recognised with great difficulty Possibly this portion contains for whom the copy was prepared etc. Some names like Surendrakīrtī and

Kṣemendrakīrti are seen in that portion On the upper margin of page 318 we have 'Lambara 1072' which possibly stands for the number of the Ms in a particular collection.

So far as the Ms. Ja is concerned, the portion which would have mentioned the place of copying is erased with black ink, but we have received this Ms from Jaipur The two other Mss clearly state that they are written at Jaipur Pha and Ja do not show uniform constitution; their dates consequently indicate the age of the concluding portion only, i e, pp 158-377 in Pha and pp 123-328 in Ja As the dates are available, Ja was written in Samvat 1833 (-57=1776 A D), Pa in Samvat 1868 (-57=1811 A D) and Pha in Samvat 1877 (-57=1820 A D) The pages 87-122 in Ja look older, and they can be assigned at least 50 years earlier than 1776 A D Apart from the form of letters, which is bound to vary from scribe to scribe, the style of writing is nearly alike in these three Mss Here and there these Mss add explanatory synonyms on the margin for certain obscure words; and the important ones are recorded by me in the foot-notes These Mss show some common orthographical peculiarities *c* and *v* are written alike, the three sibilants are freely confused, in a conjunct group with *r* as the first member, the other member is necessarily written as a duplicate, *visarga* is retained when it should have been dropped, and it is at times dropped when it should have been retained, the graphic representation for *tk*, *kt* and *ktv* is almost alike, at times *gr* is confused with *gṛ*, *mri* with *mṛ*, and *r* with *ri*, usually *ch* is written for *cch*, *bho* for *bhoh*, *udyota* for *uddyota*, *sanmukha* for *sammukha*, *hk* for *ṣk* etc Some of the words are mutually confounded, for instance, *prīti* and *prīta*, *nihita* and *nihata*, *prāpya* and *prāpa*, *Ujjayanī* and *Ujjayinī*, *aśiśrayat* and *aśiśriyat* Samdhi rules are not regularly observed at the close of Pādas The Ms Pha sometimes shows *j* for *y*.

These three Mss do not show anything like recensions, but they belong to one and the same family or group Apart from the form of colophons and the use of *yugmam*, *yugalam* or *yugalamidam*, with which, I think, the copyists have taken slight liberty, the Mss show quite minor variations among themselves In the beginning Pa, Pha and Ja show some differences Later when Pa and Pha differed, Ja agreed, now and then, either with Pa or Pha But with the change of hand-writing on folio No 157, i e, from the verse No 64 in the story No 63, Pha begins to show remarkable agreement with Pa almost upto the end With the story No 107 onwards all the three Mss closely agree in various details, and the number of different readings is almost negligible Some of the readings of Ja agree with those of Pha, but the marginal corrections thereof agree with those of Pa With the meagre evidence that is at our disposal, it is not possible to assert any direct relation between these three Mss The text-tradition presented in them shows mutual contamination, and possibly they go back to a common source a few generations of Mss back There are some significant lapses in all the three Mss inherited from the common source On p 96 of this edition, we see that all the three Mss interchanged the places of verses, Nos 183-84, even against the trend of the story The copyist of Ms Pa did detect it, and he has added a marginal suggestion Secondly, on p 226, after verse No 293, there is a confusion in the arrangement of lines I have already indicated in the foot-note how the lines require to be rearranged to give a continuous story My explanation of this confusion is like this In one of the earlier Mss, which lies at the basis of the tradition of the text preserved in Pa, Pha and Ja, the copyist might have skipped over a few lines through oversight, but realizing this omission later, he added them perhaps on the

margin of the next page putting a remark '*agre pṛṣthe likhitam asti*' at the place where they were missed The subsequent copyists transcribed this remark at the right place, but incorporated the missing lines, written on the next page, at a wrong place with the result that we have a few lines grossly misplaced in that context Lastly, on p 240, a common significant slip is seen in all the three Mss that they put three lines in verse No 71 when, in fact, the second line of No 65 appears to have been missed These typical cases go to confirm that these three Mss. go back to a common source in the near past.

(ii) Presentation of the Text

The text of the Kathākośa, presented here, cannot claim to be critical in the strict sense of the term, but it is authentic within the limits of the Mss material described above All the three Mss show a close kinship and represent identical recension, though they are not the copies of one another A close comparison helped the editor to eliminate many scribal errors and ascertain uncertain readings As the text is being edited for the first time, I have proceeded with utmost conservatism This text, moreover, belongs to a tract of medieval Sanskrit literature which shows important and interesting grammatical and lexical peculiarities that have already attracted the attention of philologists like Jacobi, Hertel, Bloomfield and others I did not want that the linguistic peculiarities should be levelled down under any rigorous editorial discipline So the agreement of the three Mss has been uniformly upheld The general spelling and other outward features of the text are presented in a standardised form The orthographical peculiarities like *ch* for *cch*, *bho* for *bhoh*, *udyot* for *uddyot*, *sanmukha* for *sammukha*, *hk* for *ṣk* etc , however, are retained, because they are so written by all the three Mss The Samdhis have been restored where it could be done without violating the metre, but difficult Samdhis, like those between *n* and *c*, *n* and *l*, *n* and *ś* etc , especially at the end of a Pāda, are not rigorously effected Absorbed vowels, whether *a* or *ā*, have been usually indicated by single or double *avagraha* for facility of understanding Important and meaningful variants are given in the foot-notes The terms like *yugmam* etc , are relegated to the foot-notes for the sake of printing convenience Nowhere the readings are emended in the body of the text The text is corrupt in many places, there are syntactical irregularities, there are deviations from the recognised grammatical standard, there are obscurities of meaning and construction, and many a Pāda is metrically defective All these are allowed to remain, when there is the agreement of the three Mss In many places, without going too far beyond the material of readings, convenient emendations could be suggested, and some of them are put in square-brackets in the foot-notes This should not be understood as some pretension of the editor to improve upon the text of Harisena but it is a modest and sincere attempt to reach the genuine readings of Harisena whose original text has suffered a good deal at the hands of copyists through generations of Mss When constituting the text, I felt myself faced with various doubts, suggestions and improvements with respect to the actual readings; and all these I have incorporated in the Notes at the end These suggestions are tentative, and the critical student is requested to take them for what they are worth Whether they are to be accepted or rejected would be apparent when some more Mss are collated and better readings are made available With this procedure I hope to have given an authentic record of the text-tradition from the three Mss used by me and presented the text as satisfactorily as it was possible for me within the limits of the material.

(iii) Numbering of the Stories

These Mss. have not correctly and regularly numbered all the stories upto the end. There are no titles for the stories at the beginning; but in this edition they are added by the editor for referential facility Every story has got only the concluding remark which is accompanied by the serial number of the story Now and then the stories are wrongly numbered usually the same number is put for two consecutive stories, but subsequently the error is corrected If all the stories are serially counted (excluding the Praśasti), the total number comes to 165 But this calculation is objectionable in view of the unanimous statement of the Mss, on p 354, that there are 157 Kathānakas in this Kathākośa Despite their irregularities in the interval, all the Mss agree to number Dhanyamitra's story as 100 The next story of Sāgaradatta is numbered as 101 by Pa and Pha, but according to Ja it is 102 which is a mistake The next nine stories or sections are not numbered at all by the Mss, so they have to be included as sub-stories of section No 102 The section with the colophon '*Bhatta-partibaddha-Cumkārikā* etc', on p. 255, is not numbered at all by Pa and Pha, but Ja puts No 103 for it The following story of Pinnākagandha is numbered 104 by all the three Mss, and if we continue this numbering, we arrive at the requisite number 157 as dictated by the Mss themselves As the material stands, this is the only way to arrive at the required number of stories, but certain discrepancies are quite apparent First, under the present arrangement adopted in this edition, the subsections are shown under chap 102, but that section (with its subsections) really concludes with a colophon (p 255) which is specifically numbered 103 by the Ms Ja. Secondly, we have to begin a section with No 102 (p 245) but end it with No (102*1) on p 249 Lastly, we feel, apparently of course, that there are only nine sub-stories, though they are expected to be ten according to an explicit remark '*daśa-kathānakam idam*' on p 255

As the present arrangement stands, it is difficult to explain the anomalies, but it is possible to rearrange some portions of the text to suit the situation, and the internal evidence is quite favourable for such a redistribution The section No 102 might end with verse No 46 on p 247, and section No 103 should begin with verse No 47 and end on p 255 with the colophon *Bhatta-pratibaddha*-etc which, as expected has already got No 103 Now in this section there should be ten stories as indicated by the remark *iti daśa-kathānakam idam* on p 255 In this proposed arrangement the sub-stories will have to be renumbered 103* 1=(102* 1), 103* 2=(102* 2) etc The sub-story 103* 1= (102* 1) is to begin with verse No 120 on p 249 In this arrangement all the facts get duly explained, and the new sections proposed possess the characteristic beginnings like other sections in this work

2 NARRATIVE TALE IN INDIA

(i) Vedic and Allied Literature

The intellectual life in India, as reflected in ancient and medieval Indian literature, is thoroughly permeated with religious thought That India is a cradle of religions is not merely a proud or sarcastic platitude, but it is a fact which can be fully attested by a large mass of evidence from literary records The earlist records of Āryans, especially the Ṛgveda, preserved on the Indian soil and handed through the hierarchy of Indian priests,

are full of devotional songs addressed to personified phenomena of nature, and later, these songs have been subjected to elaborate rituals which came to be associated, explicitly or symbolically, with every walk of life Religion inherits its sacredness or authority from the sanctity it has bestowed on the Divinity, Scripture and Hero or Teacher, and these in turn help the elaboration of religious dogmas as time passes on Every developed religion owes its allegiance to these three in some form or the other Rituals and worship, as well as devotion and meditation, are primarily associated with the first and gradually get embodied in the second Particular doctrines, dogmas and teachings constitute the Scripture which in turn glorifies the Divinity and edifies the Hero The Hero represents or is inspired by the Divinity, he has inherited or come to possess the knowledge of the Scripture, and being a successful follower of the religion, his doings are an example for others These three are interdependent and gradually contribute to the detailed evolution of religion and religious literature The growth of Indian literature fully testifies to this general procedure

Apart from its theoretical and mystical elements, religion, so far as it has grown on the Indian soil, has constantly attempted to evolve and propagate certain ethical standards for the good behaviour of man as a constituent of the society Thus religion has also played the rôle of the norm of good behaviour for the guidance of which some objective criteria were necessary They were put in various forms they may be the instructions of the Divinity inherited from times immemorial, they may be the sanctions of the old Scriptures, and they may be the preachings and examples of the Heroes of the past It is in the last tendency that we can trace the antecedents of the epic poetry, heroic legends and didactic tale in India, which began moderately but assumed massive magnitude as time passed on

The songs of Rgveda can hardly be called popular poetry, but they had their origin, in the majority of cases, in the priestly circles As a favourite of the deities addressed and as the custodian of the sacrificial cult elaborated, the priest is always trying to stand above the people, though not outside Thus he is not altogether immune from the influence of popular traditions and devoid of appeal to the people at large Vedic poetry has preserved many an interesting tale to narrate We are told how that militant Indra destroys the demons like Vrtra and removes drought and darkness Various myths are told about the twin Aśvins who are succouring divinities The priest, who possesses a correct knowledge of the sacrifice, has these gods in his power thus the priest only strengthens his hands and the cult of sacrifice by glorifying the various divinities that are said to bestow so much wellbeing on the people The so-called Ākhyāna hymns are ancient mythological ballads containing narrative and dramatic elements It is here that we come across the dialogue between Purūravas and Urvaśī and the passionate conversation between Yama and Yamī, the former, however, is elaborately immortalised in later Indian literature The Dānastutis have preserved to us lavish praise bestowed on those donors who showered their bounty on the priests, and it is quite likely that some of these patrons of sacrifices were historical persons, though unluckily we know nothing beyond their names.

As we pass on to the Brāhmanas, which present a dreary reading on account of their priestly twaddle about theology and sacrifice, their chief human interest is that they contain many myths and legends They present an enormous amount of religion and ritual which are connected very little with morality Sacrifice assumes the form of a magnificent

mechanism through which gods fulfil the worldly wishes of the sacrificer; and his enemies, on that very account, are made to suffer In order to explain some sacrificial ceremony and its efficacy, to celebrate the greatness of gods and their bounty, to sing the praise of ancient heroes and to impress on the audience the important rôle of the priestly art, ancient tales, myths and legends are narrated here and there. Despite their professed association with priestly ends and sacrificial cult, some of the tales do contain popular elements The myth of Purūravas and Urvaśī, the tale of Hariścandra and the sacrificial victim Śunaśśepa, the legend about Prajāpati are certainly interesting as narrative pieces The nucleus of the basic story is hard to be detected from the exhuberant elaboration of the tale narrated to explain, justify and glorify some sacrificial ceremony In fact the beginning of the epic poetry, with its manifold aspects, reaches back to this narrative stratum of the Brāhmanic texts.

Coming to the Upanisads we enter altogether a different world In the intellectual life of the Upanisads, the priest is receding back and almost a new horizon is in view A note of unity in theology, a complaint against the vanity of barren sacrifices and monopoly of all knowledge by the priest, yearning for the highest knowledge setting aside the conventional social disabilities, attempt to explain worldly inequality not from the favour and frown of the gods but from one's own deeds and according to the doctrine of transmigration, a gradual ousting of sacrifices and donations by pursuit of higher knowledge and asceticism, use of repeated ethico-moral exhortations to guide man as a member of the society. these are some of the outstanding traits of Upanisads which distinguish them from the Brāhmanas To explain the origin of this fresh orientation in thought Winternitz remarks 'While, then, Brahmans were pursuing their barren sacrificial science, other circles were already engaged upon those highest questions which were at last treated so admirably in the Upanisads From these circles, which originally were not connected with the priestly caste, proceeded the forest-hermits and wandering ascetics, who not only renounced the world and its pleasures, but also kept aloof from the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Brahmans Different sects, more or less opposed to Brahmanism, were soon formed from these same circles, among which sects the Buddhists attained to such great fame' [1] The Upanisadic stratum of literature, espeically in the older tract, supplies us with some interesting narratives such as the dispute between Gārgī and Yājñavalkya, the story of Satyakāma Jābāla and the incidents about Kṣatriyas like Pravāhaṇa and Aśvapati Some of these deserve to be remembered as intellectual heroes of ancient India

In the post-vedic Indian literature, there are three great narrative streams, which have already attracted the attention of critical scholars, viz , Bṛhatkathā, Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana, the first in Paiśācī Prākrit and the remaining two in Sanskrit The Bṛhatkathā of Gunādhya is lost beyond recovery, there being available only three summaries of it in Sanskrit, and the basic nucleus of the last two, as it was originally shaped by their respective authors, is almost beyond recovery, though attempts are being made by critical scholars in this direction, because these texts have reached mighty magnitude with interpolations and alterations effected by talented and propagandistic redactors, each one working in his own way in different parts of India for centuries together The Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana have already received the designation of 'epic', while the first also, despite its romantic and fairy elements, must have had the magnitude and dignity of an

[1] A History of Indian Literature, I, p. 231.

epic. The growth of the two epics is a problem by itself, and very good results are reached by critical investigators

The primary kernel of the Mahābhārata is a heroic tale belonging to the Kuru cycle of legends, especially dealing with the great Kuru battle But this secular event is imposed on with the grandiose superstructure of an encyclopaedic literature showing clear-cut strata of different types and ages This extraneous matter includes religious legends of theo-cosmological contents, independent stories such as those about Karna's birth, Yudhisthira's escape from sins by giving gifts to Brāhmanas, destruction of the Yādava race etc , religio-philosophical and ethical sections including maxims on polity and social behaviour, fables, parables and didactic narratives, and lastly a good deal of ascetic poetry The entire work, in parts and as a whole, has passed through the hands of many redactors, and all sorts of topics are admitted into the body of the text irrespective of inconsistency and mutual contradiction The Mahābhārata text, as it stands today, is moulded into its present shape, according to the opinion of competent authorities, under very strong and direct Bhārgava influence [1] This must have been preceded and followed by many a sectarian attempt of this nature Many long and short Ākhyānas etc , are simply added without much connection with the main story In any way the Mahābhārata contains a substantial stock of narratives of all sorts which have influenced later authors in their choice of topics

The Rāmāyana does not contain so much heterogeneous matter as the Mahābhārata, though this text also has grown in the hands of professional rhapsodists who wanted to meet the demands of popular taste The story of Rāma has found a place in the Mahābhārata and bears close resemblance with that in the Daśaratha-Jātaka The first and the last books of the Rāmāyana, which have been pronounced by critics as later addition, definitely betray the redactor's attempt to glorify god Visnu who is claimed to have been incarnated as Rāma Thus the sectarian hand has worked on a purely popular tale Some of the characters developed in the Rāmāyana are really interesting Sītā has been looked upon as a typical ideal of Indian womanhood and Hanumat has been the popular deity of Indian villages The fabulous birth of Sītā reminds us of the Rgvedic Furrow personified and invoked as a goddess The Rāmāyaṇa is not only an epic but the major portion betrays also the tendencies of an ornate poem where the form of the story is as much important as the contents Especially in the seventh book we come across various myths and legends, *viz* , the legend of Yayāti and Nahusa, the birth of Vaśistha and Agastya, destruction of Śambūka etc , which are interpolated at a later stage

Purānas deal with cosmogenic and legendary details and give an account of gods, saints, heroes, incarnations and royal genealogies Everywhere their didactic tone and sectarian purpose are quite plain They show close connection with the later interpolations in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa

The Rāmāyana exhibits ornate style only here and there But when we look at the Kāvya stratum of Sanskrit literature, its characteristics get clearly distinguished from those of the epic The epic poet minded primarily the subject-matter and a vigorous narration In the Kāvyas, however, the subject-matter is a feeble base for the poet to display his mastery over grammar, his facility of expression, his tricks of style, his ingenious use of poetic embellishments connected with both expression and thought, and last but not the least his thorough grounding in the elaborate and conventional theory of poetics What

[1] V. S Sukthankar The Bhṛgus and the Bhārata, Annals of the B O R I , Vol XVIII, part 1, pp 1-76,

were once virtues became vices, because the later poets, in their pedantic parade of learning, lost all sense of proportion and balance of stressing values The subject-matter, as remarked by Macdonell, 'is increasingly regarded as a means for the display of elaborate conceits, till at last nothing remains but bombast and verbal jugglery'[1] Beginning with Kālidāsa and almost upto the close of the period of the lively use of Sanskrit, the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana have become with many authors the perennial source of the subject-matter which is nicely dressed 'with lyric, erotic and didactic' spicing Among the Kāvyas the Raghuvamśa, Bhattikāvya, Rāvanavaho, Jānakīharana etc , deal with Rāma legend; while the Kirātārjunīya, Śiśupālavadha, Naisadhīya etc , are indebted to the Mahābhārata for their themes. Most of the dramas draw their themes from the two epics and the Bṛhatkathā, and there are very few plays like Mudrārāksasa and Mālatimādhava which have chosen non-epical subject for their plots Later on the poets, whether they write in prose or in verse, are not so much after the narration of the story as after the display of their learning. This is quite true especially of the prose romances like the Daśakumāra-carita, Vāsavadattā, Kādambarī etc Their authors show close acquaintance with the two epics, but their themes are not necessarily and mainly drawn from them Their style is such that these can be read only by a few intellectual aristocrats Strings of similes, plenty of puns, intricacy of style crammed with compounds these are the normal features of their diction To appreciate their literary genius and to pick up their poetical thoughts one must have undergone a long apprenticeship to the rigorous study of grammar and poetics These authors, in spite of themselves, have got a religious background with moral and didactic exhortations scattered throughout the work The didactic element becomes predominant with authors like Bhartrhari Purely amorous sentiment is depicted by poets like Amaru, but the same gets inlaid in a religious background and expressed in a mystic melody by authors like Jayadeva In these ornate compositions there is very little scope for the narrative tale

When we look at the tract of didactic fable represented by the Pañcatantra and its associates, of romantic tale specimens of which appear to have existed in the Brhtkathā and are now represented by the Vetālapañcavimśatikā etc , and of religious and moral tales samples of which are found in the epics and which are largely cultivated by the followers of different religions in their own ways, we find that the entertainment of the reader is not altogether ignored, but the desire to teach is always uppermost in the mind of the author Man is an erring animal working in various ways under the tension of internal and external forces He must be taught to understand rightly and behave properly This could be achieved, to a great extent, by exemplary tales in which birds and beasts are introduced as characters, in which imaginary figures are made to take part, or in which even gods and semi-historical persons are the actors

(ii) Śramanic Ideology Ascetic Poetry

The literature that we have reviewed so far for getting a picture, in broad outlines, of narrative tale in India from early times belongs mainly to those who have held Vedas as the highest religious authority and who owe allegiance to the Vedic religion or its direct and indirect successors A critico-historical study of Indian literature beginning with the Veda and ending with the epics and Smrtis has helped scholars to detect a gap in the philosophical evolution of religious thought embodied in this tract of literature After

[1] A History of Sanskrit Literature, p 329.

reaching the Upanişadic period, we come across novel ideas such as the doctrine of transmigration, partiality towards pessimistic and ascetic outlook on life and the superiority of Ātmavidyā over the sacrificial cult The priest has no more the monopoly of knowledge, and eminent Ksatriyas are propounding some of the above principles which, to an objective critic, have little basis either in the Veda or the Brāhmanas Before the advent of Āryans into India, we can legitimately imagine that a highly cultivated society existed along the fertile banks of Ganges and Jumna, and it had its religious teachers Vedic text have always looked with some antipathy at the Magadhan country where Jainism and Buddhism flourished; and these religions owe no allegiance to the Vedic authority The gap in the philosophical thought at the close of the Brāhmana period has necessitated the postulation of an indigenous stream of religious thought which must have influenced the Āryan thought, at the same time being influenced by the latter Different scholars have differently described this indigenous religion of Eastern India Jacobi called it Popular religion; Leumann held that its propounders were the Parivrājakas, Garbe associated it with the Ksatriyas, Rhys Davids has recognised the influence of well-organised sophistic wanderers; Winternitz conveniently designated these ideas as 'Ascetic poetry', and I called this stream of thought by the name 'Magadhan religion' As I have said elsewhere, 'we should no more assess the Sāmkhya, Jaina, Buddhistic and Ājīvika tenets as mere perverted continuations of stray thoughts selected at random from the Upanisadic bed of Āryan thought-current The inherent similarities in these systems, as against the essential dissimilarities with Āryan (Vedic and Brahmanic) religion and the gaps that a dispassionate study might detect between the Vedic (including the Brāhmanas) and Upanisadic thought-currents, really point out to the existence of an indigenous stream of thought, call it for convenience the Magadhan Religion, which was essentially pessimistic in its worldly outlook, metaphysically dualistic if not pluralistic, animistic and ultra humane in its ethical tenets, temperamentally ascetic, undoubtedly accepting the dogma of transmigration and Karma doctrine, owing no racial allegiance to Vedas and Vedic rites, subscribing to the belief of individual perfection, and refusing unhesitatingly to accept a creator [1] Jainism and Buddhism are fairly typical representatives of this Magadhan religion the background of which I have outlined thus elsewhere 'This brief survey of some of the important tenets of Jainism compared and contrasted here and there with those of other Indian systems tempts me to try to state tentatively the position of Jainism in the evolution of Indian religio-philosophical thought Its non-acceptance of Vedic authority, wholly common with Buddhism and partly with Sāmkhya, perhaps indicates that these three belong to one current of thought They have in common the theory of transmigration with the attendant pessimistic outlook of life and Karma doctrine as an automatic law of retribution which appear definitely for the first time in Upanisads so far as the Vedic literature is concerned The humane and ethical outlook and the downright denunciation of Himsā, whether for personal ends or for sacrificial purposes, are common to all the three That Buddhism and Sāmkhya have much in common is not a new thing to orientalists Ontological dualism, the plurality of spirits, the misleading of the spirit by matter, the early Sāmkhya belief that there are as many Prakrtis as there are Purusas and many other technical details are common to Jainism and Sāmkhya In all the three systems there is no place for a creator or super-human distributor of prizes and punishments These common points are not at all consistent with the natural evolution of the Vedic religion till almost the

[1] Pravacanasāra, Bombay 1935, Preface, pp 12-13

middle of the Upaniṣadic period. Especially the Sāṁkhya, which is accepted as orthodox possibly because of its fascinating terminology, in spite of its glaring inconsistencies with the accepted orthodoxy, has influenced some of the Upaniṣads; and later on being coupled with theistic Yoga it became unquestionably orthodox. In view of these common points between Jainism, Sāṁkhya and Buddhism and their common differences with the Āryo-Vedic religious forms, and in view of some of the peculiar tenets of Jainism in common with Ājīvika, Pūraṇa Kassapa's order etc., I am inclined to postulate a great Magadhan religion, indigenous in its essential traits, that must have flourished on the banks of Ganges in eastern India long before the advent of the Āryans into central India, and possibly at the end of the Brāhmana period these two streams of Āryan and indigenous religious thoughts met each other, and the mutual interaction resulted on the one hand into the Upanisads in which Yājñavalkya and others are, for the first time, preaching Ātmavidyā and on the other, in contrast to the Vedic ritualistic form of religion practised by the masses, into Jainism and Buddhism that came prominently to the fore as the strong representatives of the great heritage of Magadhan Religion'.[1]

According to Winternitz, all intellectual activities in ancient India were not confined only to Brāhmaṇas: there was not only Brahmanical literature, but there was also the *Parivrājaka, Śramana or ascetic literature. These two representatives of intellectual and* spiritual life in ancient India are well recognized by the phrase 'Samanas and Brāhmanas' in Buddhist sacred texts, by the reference to 'Samana Bambhana' in Asokan inscriptions, and by Megasthene's distinction between Brachmânai and Sarmânai. These two can be clearly distinguished by their different legends, ethical values and moral outlook. Brahmanical legends start from Vedic mythology, the great Rsis, the seers of Vedic hymns and law-givers, have achieved a position almost by the side of gods, and the gift given to the priest is a plenipotentiary. But the Śramanic legends deal with world-renouncing saints and ascetics devoted to severe penances. The Brahmanical ethics and moral creed are steeped in the system of castes, and renunciation, though admitted, does not play an important rôle. Knowledge of the Veda, sacrifice and respect to the Brāhmanas have been given great importance. Ethical values have a conventional import: charity means liberality towards the Brāhmanas, self-sacrifice implies absolute devotion to the priests, and the king's promotion to the heaven depends upon his obedience to the priest. But the ethical ideal of the ascetic poetry is different: here the ethical discipline and renunciation are practised as the means for obtaining emancipation, the saint fears no being and holds no terror to others, he is the exalted embodiment of self-denial and self-sacrifice, sages of all ranks practise these ideals, and Ahimsā and Maitrī are the highest principles of moral life.

The ascetic morality is based on the belief in transmigration and Karman. Everywhere bitter complaints are expressed against the nature of Samsāra, there is a pessimistic attitude towards life, and stress is laid on the eternal bliss of liberation. These ideas are hardly met with in the Veda. There are a few casual traces of the Karma doctrine in the Chāndogya and Brhadāranyaka where characteristically enough it is taught by a king to the Brāhmana. The pessimistic note, so patent in ascetic poetry, appears only in the latest Upanisads.

This ascetic poetry has left its influence on the Mahābhārata and on the Jaina and Buddhistic texts, as it is clear from the Pitāputra-samvāda the counterparts of which are

[1] Pravacanasāra, Intro., pp. 94-95.

found in the Jātaka and in the Uttarādhyayana The Mahābhārata has got many such sections, for instance, Vidurahitavākya (5, 32-40), Dhṛtarāṣṭra-śokāpanodana (Strīparvan 2-7), the famous parable of the 'Man in the Well', which is also present in the Jaina and Buddhist works, the instructions of Dharmavyādha (Vanaparvan 207-16), Tulādhāra-Jājali-samvāda (Śānti 261-64), the section of Yajñanindā (XII, 272 etc), the Go-kapilīya section (Ibid 269-71), the detachment of Janaka (XII, 178) which is common with Jaina and Buddhist texts, the story of hunter and doves (Śānti 143-49), the tale of Mudgala (III 260 f), etc Some of the principles inculcated and some of the moral values advocated in these sections are not quite consistent with the Brahmanical morality already expressed in other contexts

As to the historical position of this ancient Indian ascetic poetry, the Mahābhārata cannot be the original source, because these sections are found in the latest stratum, so many of these discourses may have existed independently before they were taken up in the Mahābhārata In conclusion Winternitz says, 'I am inclined to think that ascetic poetry and the peculiar view of life expressed in it, first arose in an old form of Yoga which was merely a system of ethics and a practical theory of redemption, that could as easily be combined with Sāmkhya, as with Buddhist and Jaina teaching Both Sāmkhya and Yoga though taken up into the folds of orthodox Brāhmanism were originally not Brāhmanical, but independent of the Veda' He accepts the position that 'some of the legends and maxims of the ascetic poetry contained in the epic are doubtless borrowed from Jaina or Buddhistic texts' As to the common legends and maxims, there are two possibilities 'the original may have been either Buddhist or Jain, or the parallel passages may all go back to the same source, an older ascetic literature, that probably arose in connection with Yoga or Sāmkhya-Yoga teaching' [1]

Though the approach is slightly different, there is much common ground between the Ascetic literature discussed above and the Magadhan religion outlined by me but for the geographical bias of the latter, both the terms connote nearly the same stock of ideas Unfortunately the works of sophists like Mankhali Gosāla, Pūrana Kassapa, etc , have not come down to us In the ancient Indian literature that has come down to us, one can say without hesitation, in view of the nature of the legends and the ethico-religious outlook outlined by Winternitz, that Jaina and Buddhistic literatures are the major custodians of ascetic poetry, and Jainism and early Buddhism are the best representatives of the Magadhan religion

(iii) Early Buddhist Literature

Throughout Buddhist literature, which is studied more exhaustively and critically than Jaina literature, the personality of Buddha wields tremendous influence on the reader almost at every context Buddha is a master-physician who wants to cure man of his miseries by prescribing to him his religious principles As a successful teacher, he rightly grasped men and their minds, and we learn that he used to tell many amusing and agreeable tales, both instructive and pleasant, which made all beings happy in this and the next world Illustration has played a remarkable rôle in the Indian mode of thought, and the

[1] This is a short summary of an excellent paper 'Ascetic Literature in Ancient India' by Winternitz in his Some Problems of Indian Literature, Calcutta 1925, also his paper 'Jainas in Indian Literature' Indian Culture I, 2, October 1934

syllogism necessarily includes an Udāharaṇa. This necessitated the teacher to keep himself well-acquainted with different walks of life from which illustrations were drawn that they might immediately convince the people about the intelligence of the teacher and about the veracity of his preachings It is quite likely that Buddha included popular tales in his preachings Pāli literature presents abundant evidence that Buddhist monks and preachers profusedly illustrated their sermons with tales of piety, religious suffering, successful penance and the attainment of Arhatship 'They sometimes invented pious legends, but more frequently they took fables, fairy tales, and amusing anecdotes from the rich store-house of popular tales or from secular literature, altering and adapting them for the purpose of religious propaganda The Bodhisattva dogma, in connection with the doctrines of rebirth and Karma, was an excellent expedient for turning any popular or literary tale into a Buddhist legend'[1] Similes and parables have a great effect on the audience, and they convince the hearer more easily than a legion of abstruse arguments, eminent teachers, therefore, always used them to spice their sermons

Beginning with the Vinayapitaka, the rules and regulations in the Khandakās are introduced by narratives illustrating the occasion when they were announced by Buddha In the Cullavagga too we come across many edifying anecdotes some of them are conversion-stories and some of them deserve to be interwoven either in the life of the Buddha or the Buddhist order The stories such as those of Sāriputta, Moggallāna, Mahāpajāpati, Upāli, Jīvaka etc , have a perennial sociological and psychological interest In the Dīghanikāya and the Majjhimanikāya of the Suttapitaka we come across bits of information connected with Buddha's biography We have dialogues like the Payāsisutta, and there are myths and legends which illustrate a doctrine or convey a moral Stories of Channa, Assalāyana etc , have an appearance of some factual occurrence The tale of the robber Angulimāla who became a monk and reached the status of an Arhat, the legend of king Makhādeva who entered the order of monks at the first appearance of grey hair, and Ratthapāla's renunciation and subsequent strictures on the vanity of worldly pleasures—these are some of the fine specimens of ballad narrative edifying ascetic ideals The two texts Vimānavatthu and Petavatthu give stories, all made after one model, which illustrate how a happy or unhappy existence in the next world with its splendour or torment was acquired these stories are meant to prove the universality and the efficacy of the doctrine of Karman When the individuals concerned are made to explain their fate, such narrations would certainly have an effect on the believing hearers The commentators are there to supply the requisite details in full Thera- and Therī-gāthā are collections of spiritual confessions of souls of monks and nuns yearning for peace Undoubtedly these are ascetic heroes whose utterances are to enlighten and whose examples are to inspire others that want to follow the spiritual ideal Some of them appear to be historical persons The verses uttered by them do not give any biographical details, but the corresponding Apadāna stories and the commentary of Dharmapāla give good many details about these monks and nuns Most of these stories look like mechanical patterns, but as tales meant for a moral exhortation, they have a definite significance The names have not got much value, but the spirit of asceticism, the working of the Karma doctrine, truth of moral values and the need of a pious life are all impressed upon the believers by these stories When one looks at the tales of men and women of different status in life who are inspired by religious ideals and necessarily adopt the monastic life, it only means that ascetic values wielded a great

[1] Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, VII, p. 491

influence on the outlook of these story-writers. Some of these stories are interesting as pieces of genuine didactic tale and realistic pictures of life

Then there are two other extensive tracts of early Buddhistic narrative literature that preach moral and ascetic ideals interwoven in a story The first is the Jātaka, and the second the Apadāna According to Buddhist terminology[1], Jātaka is a story in which Buddha, in one of his earlier births, plays some part, it may be as a hero or any other character or even as a mere witness The dogma of Bodhisattva, coupled with the doctrines of transmigration and Karman, could turn any tale into a Jātaka These Jātakas not only heightened the greatness of Buddha's personality, but quietly propagated also the ideas of rebirth and Karman, and established certain moral standards in the society for its collective welfare Some of the stories that came to be put into the Jātaka from are already found in the Suttas as simple tales If they are stripped of the personality of Bodhisattva and special Buddhistic outlook and terminology, we find that their contents include fables, fairy tales, anecdotes, romantic and adventurous tales, moral stories and sayings, and legends These have been drawn from the common stock of Indian folklore which is utilised by different religious schools in their own way

To be distinguished from the Jātaka tale is the Apadāna story which gives the life of its hero or heroine in one or more births laying stress on their good or bad acts and their concomitant consequences in subsequent births They are the tales of heroic deeds, namely, the pious and religious acts of men and women 'An Apadāna, like a Jātaka, has both "a story of the past" and "a story of the present", but it differs from a Jātaka in that the latter refers always to the past life a of Buddha, whereas an Apadāna deals usually, not always, with that of an Arhat' Many of them are good legends of saints, and some of them are identical with monks and nuns celebrated in the Thera- and Therīgāthā Usually they are related in the first person Some of the names are quite historical, and a few of them like Sāriputta, Ānanda, Rāhula, Khemā, Kisāgotamī are well-known in the Buddhistic hierarchy from other sources But most of the tales have a mechanical form and contents, and they appear to have been specially framed to glorify some pious act or the other The great commentators like Buddhaghosa and Dharmapāla quote plenty of legends both of the Jātaka and the Apadāna type in their various commentaries[2], and these constitute an important bulk of Buddhistic narrative tales The tendency of uphold religious and ascetic ideals is quite patent in all these stories

(iv) Jaina Literature

(a) *Canonical Stratum*

Turning to Jaina literature, the Ardhamāgadhī canon, though recast into its present shape much later, contains undoubtedly old portions which can be assigned quite near to the period of Mahāvīra, the last Tīrthakara of the Jainas We possess in this canon a good bit of narrative portion which is characterised by didactic and edifying outlook it covers biographies of religious heroes such as Tīrthakaras and their ascetic disciples including the Śalākāpurusas, explanatory similes, parables and dialogues, and didactic

[1] Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, the article on the Jātaka, A History of Pāli Literature by B C Law (Calcutta 1937), Vol I, pp 271 ff

[2] See for instance, Buddhist Legends, by Burlingame in Harvard O Series, vols 28-30, Cambridge, Mass, 1921

and exemplary tales and pattern stories of men and women turning into monks and nuns and attaining better births in the next life

The two texts, Ācārāṅga and Kalpasūtra[1], give a biography of Mahāvīra vividly describing the hardships which he had to undergo in his monastic life, and Bhagavatī, in its different dialogues, gives some side-light of Mahāvīra's personality, especially his skill in debates and in offering explanations in reply to the questions of his numerous pupils, male and female The lives of other Tīrthakaras, narrated in the Kalpasūtra, are no biographies at all, but supply the reader with a string of names (*nāmāvalī*) with which perhaps the reciter is to give a detailed account We get some glimpses of the life of Nemi, Pārśva etc in other texts also

What must have been simple similes in the beginning are shaped into narrative pieces with a view to work out the simile in all its details and to deduce a lesson from it for the benefit of pious believers Nāyādhammakahāo gives us some good examples A tortoise is known to be guarded with regard to its limbs, a gourd sinks when covered with mud, and the fruits of Nandī tree are harmful These ideas are used for the purpose of teaching some lesson or the other, and they illustrate how the unguarded monks suffer, how those loaded with Karmas sink to the bottom of hell, and how those who taste the pleasures of life suffer in the long run Almost on similar lines parables are elaborated either as a narrative piece or in a lively dialogue, and every detail conveys some lesson The parable of the Lotus in the Sūyagadam is an elaborate piece There is a great lake full of lotuses in the midst of which stands a grand lotus Four men from four quarters come there and try to pluck that grand lotus, but they were not successful A monk, however, succeeds in plucking it even from the bank merely by uttering certain words The lake is the world, the lotuses, the men, the grand lotus, the king, the four men, the heretics, and the monk is the Jaina saint who, by uttering the true word of faith, wins over the king, and his religion is triumphant Apart from the intended purpose of the parable, one point is plain to us that religions thrived well under royal patronage which consequently was sought with competition The parable of four daughters-in-law, in the Nāyādhammakahāo, is a simple folk-tale skilfully used for religious purpose A shrewd father-in-law entrusts five grains of rice to his four daughters-in-law with an instruction that they should be returned whenever demanded The first daughter-in-law is vain and indifferent and throws them away thinking that there is plenty of rice in the granary, and second also thinks alike but swallows them, the third carefully preserves them in her jewel-casket, and the fourth plants them and reaps a rich harvest with the result that she has a large stock of rice at the end of five years The father-in-law punishes the first two, entrusts the third with the entire property, and hands over the whole management of the household to the fourth The four women represent the monks, and the grains of rice are the five great vows Some neglect them, some observe them carefully, while there are some noble monks who not only observe them but also propagate them for the benefit of others. The story of Māyandi princes is a mariners' tale developed into a parable and used to exhort the need of firm faith in religious principles The Uttarādhyayana also gives some parables The parable of the ram (chap VII) brings out the fate of a being fed with worldly pleasures and instructs how human life is the capital with which heaven is to be gained if the capital

[1] For the editions etc , of these texts the readers are referred to A History of Indian Literature by Winternitz, Vol II (Calcutta 1933) and Die Lehre der Jainas by Schubring (Berlin and Leipzig 1935). For economy of space only essential bibliographical references are given

is lost, one is born as a denizen of hell or a brute. The leaf of the tree (chap X) discourses on the fleeting character of human pleasures with appealing similes, and repeated warnings are given to the aspirant to be ever vigilent 'The wicked bullocks' (chap XXVI) is a homely but biting criticism against quarrelsome pupils who are a nuisance to the teacher.

We come across a good number of legendary tales which are illustrative of the good and bad results of the practice of virtues and vices The characters in the story attain better worlds and even liberation by following the principles preached by Mahāvīra, Pārśva or Nemi, or they go to wretched births and even hell by violating them Many heretics are shown to have been converted to the creed of Tīrthakaras. Some of these tales are purely Jaina in origin, while others are drawn from the common stock of Indian tales, though used to propagate Jaina virtues, and have their counterparts in Hindu and Buddhist literatures Many of these legends are connected with famous cycles of tales associated with outstanding personalities like Krsna, Brahmadatta, Śreṇika etc According to Jainism the virtues of a pious house-holder or lady are necessarily conducive to ascetic life, and a layman, if he steadily follows the steps of religious life, automatically reaches the stage of monastic life Naturally most of these legends are ascetic in outlook The Śramaṇic religion, especially Jainism, has laid great stress on asceticism with the result that the Jaina literature gives us some lives of ascetic heroes that passed through exceptional sufferings at the hands of gods, men and lower beings, practised severe penances maintaining the spiritual balance at the critical moment of death, and thus attained a higher status of life in the next birth It is quite probable that many of them are factual in origin referring to historical ascetics, though the details might have got elaborated in course of time Sometimes their names are simply referred to, and it is the commentators that supply the necessary details

Besides the casual references to Śiśupāla, Dvīpāyana, Parāśara etc , the Sūyagadam refers to the story of Ārdraka about whom the Niryukti and the commentaries give interesting details The text shows how he refuted Gośāla, a Buddhist, a Vedāntin and a Hastitāpasa After defeating the opponents he was going to Mahāvīra, an elephant broke the chains and rushed against him, but on approaching him, bent on its keens to salute him King Śreṇika, who witnessed the scene, wondered how the elephant could break the chains. Ārdraka replied that it was still more strange that a man could break the fetters of worldliness Often we meet with discussions and doctrinal clarification between the pupils of Pārśva and those of Mahāvīra in texts like Uttarādhyayana More than once pious men and women, such as Śivarāja, Sudarśana, Śaṁkha, Somila, Jayantī etc , (in the Bhagavatī) approach Mahāvīra and get some dogmatical explanation

There are many stories, definitely didactic, which illustrate the consequences of good and bad deeds In the Nāyādhammakahāo, prince Meha, when he is growing mentally unsteady, is confirmed in his faith in the ascetic life by Mahāvīra who narrates to him how he, in his earlier life as an elephant, had protected a hare by patiently holding up the foot The merchant Dhanna, who is chained together with the murderer of his son, had to partake meals with him out of sheer physical necessity, similarly the monks should eat food etc , simply to sustain the body, and not to grow strong or to look well, so that they might carry on their religious duties King Selaga who was converted to the creed of Ariṣṭanemi becomes negligent about his duties being addicted to wine, but is duly enlightened by one of his faithful pupils The story exhorts the monks to be vigilant about the details of ascetic life Mallī is destined to be born a female as a result of a bit of hypocrisy in the

religious practices in an earlier life, and she teaches her six suitors, the colleagues of a former life, through a golden image with rotten food inside, about the inner hatefulness of her apparently beautiful body and thereby induces them to renounce the world Finally they all attain liberation King Jiyasattu was led to the true faith by his minister Subuddhi who demonstrates to him the changeability of all things by the filtration of drinking water from mud The layman Nanda is born as a frog because of his excessive attachment for the lake and the surrounding accessories of pleasure built by him for the benefit of his fellow-citizens As such he proceeds to Mahāvīra but is crushed on the way under the foot of Śreṇika's horse and dies with the formula of confession by which he is born as a god Poṭṭilā, the wife of the minister Teyāliputta, enters the order finding that she had lost the affection of her husband After she is born as a god, she repeatedly tries, according to the previous promise, to enlighten Teyāliputta, but he is convinced about the value of renunciation only when he has fallen on bad days after losing king's favour and after attempting to commit suicide At last he becomes a monk, and converts the king who asks his forgiveness In the end they attain liberation Dhammaruī, who eats himself the poisonous food to save the life of ants, becomes a god and subsequently attains liberation, while Nāgasiri, who offered that food, becomes sick and poor She is reborn as Sukumāliyā who becomes a nun not being liked by her suitors The sight of a harlot enkindles her passion, and she entertains a hankering for love-satisfaction in the next life She becomes first a harlot of the gods, is born subsequently as princess Dovaī and married to all the five Pāndavas Paumanābha, the king of Avarakamkā, on account of the mischief of Nārada, robs her, but was conquered by Kanha Vāsudeva who takes her back to her five husbands. After paying respects to Aristanemi and practising severe penances in due course, the five Pāndava monks and Dovaī attain liberation Cilāya, a robber, kidnaps Sumsumā but suffers a good deal as he has to run away simply cutting her head and taking it with him; in the same manner suffer those monks who are addicted to physical pleasures The father Dhanna and his sons, who were pursuing the thief, feed themselves on the headless trunk of Sumsumā just to save their life, similarly the monks and nuns are to eat food etc, merely to sustain their body and enable themselves to carry out their ascetic duties Such monks finish their journey safely like Dhanna and his sons The layman king Pundarīka allows his brother Kandarīka to enter the order and tries to help him to continue as a monk when he is sick and ailing A second time he is not successful, so they interchange their places Kandarīka finds the pleasures of royalty to be painful and goes to hell after death, while Pundarīka becomes a worthy monk and attains liberation The lesson of the story is quite apparent that monks should follow Pundarīka's example All these stories have some lesson or the other for devoted monks

The Uvāsagadasāo presents ten narratives which are pattern-stories, glorifying the lay-followers that are an example for others They are all put as contemporaries of Mahāvīra who prescribes the elaborate vows following which they attain liberation in due course Ānanda is a model Uvāsaga who acquires Avadhi-jñāna by practising the vows and observances Kāmadeva, Cūlanīpiya, Surādeva and Cullasayaya stick to their vows in spite of external temptations and threats even when life was in danger, when relatives were persecuted, and when their health and possessions were at stake Kuṇḍakoliya is firm in his faith and could not be tempted to the creed of Gosāla Saddālaputta is converted from the Ājīvika faith to the creed of Mahāvīra; and it was not possible for Gosāla to win him back Mahāsayaya was a pious house-holder, his vicious wife tried to tempt him, but was consequently cursed by him that she should be born in hell, Mahāvīra told him to repent

and confess for his curse which he did, and attained liberation in due course Nandiṇīpiya and Sālihīpiya are pious householders that attain liberation duly These stories are moulded in such a pattern that it is possible to multiply them to any number by simply changing the names etc the purpose is the same, though the names and a few other details differ Dadhapaiṇṇa appears to be a symbolical name for a soul that has developed firm faith and thus attains liberation his biography is found both in the Uvavāiya and Rāyapaseṇaijja

Taking into account the stereotyped plan of narration and the division into Vargas, we can group together the second Śrutaskandha of Nāyādhammakahāo, Antagaḍa-, Anuttarovavāiya-dasāo and the Nirayāvaliyāo which comprises the last five Upāngas In the second section of Nāyā, it is expected of the reciter to elaborate from the skeleton, proper names and catchwords of the story 206 stories of which that of Kālī alone is given in full They are all meant to explain how certain goddesses came to have their positions on account of their religious practices in earlier births Kālī, for instance, hears the preachings of Pārśva and becomes a nun under the guidance of Pupphacūlā As expected of her, she is not indifferent to the body, but is much attached to the toilet and has to go out of the Gaṇa consequently She practises fasts etc, and is born as a goddess She comes to Mahāvīra to honour him, and he narrates to Gautama about her future fate

The stories in the Antagada-dasāo fall into two divisions according as they are associated with the age of Aritṭha-Nemi and Kanha Vāsudeva or Mahāvīra and Seniya These ninety-two lessons give us tales of men and women who put an end to Samsāra and attain liberation after conforming to the creed of Tīrthakaras One feels overwhelmed by the idea that men and women even from royal families are getting themselves initiated into the order the call of spiritual freedom is demanding a sort of religious recruit on a grand scale and thus swelling the ranks of ascetic legions A few stories are given in full and the rest are to be mechanically multiplied The story of Gayasukumāla is a typical ascetic tale illustrating penancial heroism and forbearance The six male children of Devakī were transferred, through the divine courtesy of Harinegamesī, to the lap of Sulasā and had entered the ascetic order When Devakī was pining that no son was with her and even Krsna visited her after six months, Krsna obtained a boon by propitiating that very deity whereby Gayasukumāla was born to her Despite persuasion to the contrary, the prince entered the order to the offence of his father-in-law Somila who felt that his daughter wsa neglected by him in her prime of youth One day when he was practising penance on the burial ground, Somila, in a mood of revenge, prepared an earthen basin on his head and poured burning charcoal there The young monk patiently bore the pangs, successfully destroyed the Karman and attained liberation Somila, however, died a premature death at the sight of Krsna This text supplies us with the information about the destruction of Dvārakā and the Yādava clan The story of Mudgarapāni taking the cudgel against the vagabonds that were ill-treating his devotees, the gardener Arjunaka and his wife Bandhumatī, is a fine piece of folk-tale to make people devoted to the village deities, but the fact that Mudgarapāni is helpless against pious Sudarsana only shows how it is used to establish the superiority of Mahāvīra's followers Arjuna is converted to the creed of Mahāvīra, as a monk he patiently puts up with all insults and pains, and at last by his penances he attains liberation The tale of prince Atimuktaka only shows how spiritual problems induced youths to enter the order of monks and have them solved by finally attaining liberation through penancial discipline.

The Anuttarovavāiya-dasāo illustrates the stories of persons who attained highest heavenly mansions by practising penances That of Dhanna is a typical story and shows how fasts played an important part in the discipline of ascetic life

The Nirayāvaliyāo gives us a graphic description of the birth of Kūṇiya, the son of Seniya by his wife Cellaṇā, who wanted to eat the flesh of her husband during the period of her pregnancy-longing, and somehow her step-son managed to fulfil her desire She feared that the issue would be a bane to the dynasty, and in fact she tried to do away with the child but without success As foreseen by her, Kūniya really grew into a wicked prince He wanted to capture his father's throne during his life-time by putting him into prison, and he tried to wrest from his brother Vehalla the paternal gift to him of a necklace and an elephant Vehalla, however, sought shelter with his maternal grand-father Cetaka who made alliance with nine Mallakis and nine Licchavis to defend the just cause of Vehalla against Kūniya and his ten step-brothers In the great battle that ensued Kūniya and his ten brothers died and went to the Hemābha hell The Kappiyā continues the narratives of the sons of Kāla and others who entered the order under Mahāvīra and attained various heavens as a result of their religious practices The Pupphiyā narrates the story of Angai of Sāvatthī who was initiated into the order by Pārśva and who was consequently born as a moon in the lunar region as a result of his monastic discipline The next interesting story is that of Somila, the learned Brahmin, who was almost converted by Pārśva, but he grows slack, adopts Brahmanic ways of life by planting trees etc, and becomes a Disāpokkhiya monk A god, however, enlightened him, he resumed Jaina vows, and after severe penances he became Śukra planet and would attain liberation in due course Subhadrā yearned for children, but she had none She became first a lay woman and then a nun in the Jaina church, but her longing for children remained and she began to fondle the children of others Though banished from the monastic congregation, she remained a nun but continued nursing children Consequently she was born as an attendant-goddess Bahuputrikā In the next birth she was born as Somā, was married to a Brahmin Rāstrakūta and had sixteen twins within sixteen years She got disgusted with this life, entered the order, and in due course attained liberation The Pupphacūlā narrates stories of ladies who were good disciples of the nun Pupphacūlā and secured heavenly status Bhūtā, for instance, was a pupil of Pārśva and was admitted to the order of nuns She had a fancy for washing everything with water against monastic rules As a result of this, she first reached only the heaven and then attained liberation later in the Mahāvideha country The Vanhidasāo gives stories of twelve Vṛṣṇi, princes, the sons of Baladeva The glories attained by prince Nisadha, the disciple of Nemi, are explained by a reference to his past life as prince Vīrāngada who practised penance for fortyfive years, was subsequently born in heaven and then became Nisadha As to his future, he would become a monk, go to heaven and then later attain liberation

The Vivāgasuyam, as its title indicates, gives narratives to illustrate the unhappy and happy consequences of wicked and pious acts The first section gives ten stories illustrating the fruits of wicked acts, while the second gives only one story about good deeds and the remaining stories are to be mechanically narrated Ikkāi, the district officer, was cruel and oppressed people with heavy taxes etc., as a result of this he suffered incurable diseases in this life and was born as Miyāputta, of foul constitution, in the next birth Passing through various lives of beasts and birds, he would be born as a merchant-prince;

he adopts Jaina vows, becomes a monk, and goes to heaven, and at last he attains liberation. The hunter Bhīma killed many beasts to satisfy the pregnancy-longing of his wife for flesh and wine She gave birth to a child, Gottāsaya by name, that grew into a wicked hunter, excessively addicted to flesh and wine In the next life he was born as Ujjhitaka, a despicable boy, who proved to be a curse to the family, was given to vices like gambling, woman and wine, and was ordered to the gallows by the king as a punishment for his debauchery Subsequently he would pass through various worldly and hellish births, then go to heaven from the birth of a merchant-prince where he acquires right knowledge, and thereafter he would get liberation Ninnaya was a cruel dealer in eggs of which he enjoyed several dishes This sin led him to hell, and thence he was born as Abhaggasena, a tyrant and oppressive robber, who was a nuisance to the surrounding territory King Mahābala, finding that it was not easy to defeat Abhagga, invited him cordially for a feast, and then, closing the city-gates, ordered his execution After wandering long in Samsāra, Abhagga would be born as a man, enter the order and finally attain liberation A shepherd Chaniya by name killed several animals and enjoyed and sold dishes of meat This sin led him to hell, and thence he was born as a son Sagada to Bhaddā who had lost many of her children After the child-birth, the family fell on evil days, Sagada grew vicious and debaucherous, and became attached to Sudarśanā, a kept mistress of the minister He was dragged before the king who gave him capital punishment by making him embrace a red hot female statue Mahāvīra prophesied that Sagada and Sudarśanā would be later born as twins and would live as husband and wife Consequently he would go to hell and pass through a series of births As a merchant-prince he would enter the ascetic order and finally attain liberation The royal priest Mahesaradatta celebrated human sacrifices so that the king's enemies might be destroyed This sin took him to hell whence he was reborn as Bahassaīdatta, the family priest, with free access to the royal harem On account of his vicious relation with the queen, the king ordered him to be impaled publicly Mahāvīra predicted that his soul would pass through various lower births, become a human being, practise asceticism and finally attain liberation Dujjohana was a cruel jailor that inflicted manifold tortures on the convicts He went to hell and was thence born as prince Nandivardhana who tried to murder his father Siridāma through a barber but was detected and ordered to be executed Mahāvīra foretells that he would migrate like Ujjhiyaya and attain liberation The physician Dhanvantari enjoyed and prescribed meat-preparations, and this sin led his soul to hell Thence he was born as a merchant-prince Umbaradatta He proved a bane to the family, and wandered in the town suffering from several diseases simultaneously Mahāvīra prophesied that his future fate would be similar to that of Miyāputta The cook Sirīya employed hunters, fowlers and fishermen to catch animals, birds and fish, and enjoyed and sold meat-dishes In the subsequent birth, he was born as the fisherman Soriyadatta Not only he sold fish to the public but also enjoyed fish-preparations He suffered terribly on account of a fish-bone sticking in his throat His future career, Mahāvīra said, would be like that of Miyāputta King Sihaseṇa burnt alive his 499 queens and their mothers who conspired against the life of Sāmā, his favourite queen By this sin he was destined to go to hell whence he was born as a beautiful daughter Devadattā She was married to Pūsanandi who was very much attached to his mother She did not like this and killed the mother-in-law with a hot iron bar The king ordered Devadattā to be impaled Her future career would be like that of Miyāputta The courtezan Pudhavisirī seduced many persons of different status in life As a result of this sin, she went to hell and was further reborn as a beautiful girl

Añjū. She became a queen but suffered a lot on account of her vaginal pain which was incurable Her future career, Mahāvīra prophesied, would be like that of Devadattā. The second section deals with the fruit of pious acts The pious layman Sumuha received the monk Sudatta with pure and plenty of food Consequently he had his journey of Samsāra shortened and was subsequently born as prince Subāhu of magnificent fortune He received vows under Mahāvīra Later on he would study scriptures, practise austerities, go to heaven and subsequently attain liberation With the difference in names, the remaining stories are similar to that of Subāhu

The didactic tone of these stories is apparent They want to give lessons in good behaviour both to monks and householders or to nuns and house-ladies The pictures of the past and future and the horrors of transmigratory circuit warn the believer to tread the path of piety, even if he has erred, there is a better future for him, and he should follow the instructions of a teacher like Mahāvīra Asceticism is a sovereign remedy against all the ills of this and next life The sins enumerated and professions condemned give a fine glimpse of the ethical code which Jainism has always insisted upon

The appeal to ascetic sentiments is worked out in a vigorous poetic background in some of the stories of the Uttarādhyayana King Nemi enters the order of monks after refuting the arguments of Indra guised as a Brahmin who wanted to test his faith (chap IX) The legend of Harieśi sets aside the traditional value of sacrifice, and self-control and penance are held in great reverence (chap. XII) The story of Citta and Sambhūta (chap XIII) belongs to the great cycle of tales about king Brahmadatta, and is a common property of Jaina, Buddhistic and Hindu works [1] King Brambhadatta goes to hell, while the monk Citta attains liberation this again conveys the superiority of ascetic values (chap XIII) The chapter Usuyārijjam pleads so strongly for monastic values that it leads to a group-renunciation on the part of the king, queen and others Ariṣṭanemi's renunciation with compassion towards the victims of the wedding-feast, Rājīmatī's devotion to him and her consequent retirement, her eloquent chastisement of wavering Rathanemi who was enlightened by her, and the attainment of liberation after severe penances the chapter Rahanemijjam (XXII), which nicely depicts these events, is a brilliant piece of ascetic poetry The chapter Samjaijjam (XVIII) gives some idea of the early capital of Jaina legends about ascetic heroes some of the names of these outstanding persons are known to us from other sources The list includes twelve Cakravartins, four Pratyekabuddhas and other kings like Udāyana, Kāśīrāja, Vijaya and Mahābala Some of the legends like that of Miyāputta (chap XIX) give a nice occasion for the text to present a good deal of didactic instruction, moral exhortation and dogmatic details

Coming to the Païnnas, some of them are full of references to stories about pious persons and ascetic heroes [2] There was a nun Pupphacūlā at Poyaṇapura, her religious preceptor was Anniyāutta, while crossing the river Ganges he was thrown off from the boat, and he died piously and attained the highest object (S 56-57) Amayaghosa of Kāyandī abdicated the throne for his son and toured all over the earth practising religion after mastering the scripture, when he returned to the metropolis, Caṇḍavega wounded

[1] See Charpentier's Intro, pp 44 etc, and Notes, pp 327 etc, of his ed of the Uttarā, Uppsala 1922

[2] Taking into consideration the crucial names, an attempt is made here to arrange them alphabetically The references are to the Āgamodaya Samiti ed, Bombay 1927 See also Über die vom Sterbefasten handelnden ältern Paiṇṇa des Jaina-Kanons by Kurt von Kamptz, Hamburg 1929 In this section Bh =Bhattaparinnā, M =Maraṇasamāhī, S =Samthāraga

his body, and when his limbs were being cut, he died and attained the highest object (S 76-78) Avanti Sukumāla of Ujjayanī heard one evening the description of Nalinī-vimāna, was reminded of heaven, entered the ascetic order, and sat in steady meditation under a bamboo grove in a lonely corner of the cemetery His body was being dragged and bitten piteously by a carnivorous jackal for three days He was indifferent, firm like the mountain and tolerated the agony When he died piously and attained the highest object, gods showered scented water with flowers, and to this day we have the pond Gandhavatī there (Bh 160, M 435-39 and S 65-66) Ilāputta is an example of non-attachment for the world (M 483) King Vesamanadāsa of Kunāla had a heretical minister Rittha by name There was a learned preceptor Usahasena who had a well-read pupil in Sīhasena Being defeated in a debate, that cruel Riṭṭha set Usahaseṇa on fire one evening as he was being burnt, he died piously and attained the highest object (S 81-84) Kandariya and Pundariya,[1] who were destined respectively for lower and upper births, go to Anuttara region by their firm attitude for a day (M 637) Even after staying with friends, the soul is all alone when quitting the body like Kaṇha at the time of his death Kanha had conquered anger by forbearance (M 377, 496-97)[2] The monk Kattiya (the son of king Aggi), physically dirty yet endowed with virtues, when he was wandering for food in the town of Rohīdaya, was struck with a javelin by Kuñca Enduring that agony he quitted the body piously and attained the highest object (S 67-69, Bh 160A noted by Kamptz) The monk Kālavesiya, the son of Jiyasattu of Mathurā, is said to have been eaten by a jackal in his illness on the mount Moggalla (M 498) Kidhī, the son of a householder, felt happy after abstaining from theft (Bh 106) Kisi is well-known for his forbearance even when he did not get food (M 497) The merchant Kuberadatta, full of infatuation as he was, could not distinguish, like Vesiyāna, with whom to unite or not to unite, and had criminal intimacy with his daughter (Bh 113) In the town of Kumbhārakada there were five hundred monks, namely, Khandaya and his pupils, endowed with ascetic virtues All of them, except one, were crushed under a wheel (or in a machine) They suffered peacefully, continuing their meditation and bearing no ill will, died piously and attained the highest object (M 443, 495, S 58-60) The young monk Kurudatta, while meditating with a religious vow in the forest, was burnt at Gajapura and consequently attained the highest object (M 492, S 85) A monk, though free from attachment and penance-worn, degrades himself by the company of women like that saint who dwelt in the house of Kosā (Bh 128) Gangadatta, Vissabhūi and Candapingala supply good illustrations of anger, hatred and infatuation (Bh 137) Possibly there were two Gayasukumālas the first had his body burnt by his father-in-law on the cemetery[3], he tolerated the burning sensation and did not swerve from his religious practices (M 431-32, 492) The second one was pinned to the ground like wet skin with hundreds of nails, and he died piously (S 87) The king Candavadimsaya was steady and firm in the hour of his death and thus achieved his object (M 440-1) In the town of Pādaliputta, that famous Cānakya abstained from preliminary sins, and submitted himself to Ingini-marana Getting due respect and vanquishing the enemy, he had his body burnt (?) When he was observing Prāyopagamana in a cowpen, the cow-dung cakes were set on fire by cruel Subandhu (or Subuddhi); he remained firm, though burnt, and

[1] Cf Nāyādhammakahāo XX and see above, p 21

[2] Cf Antagaḍadasāo, 5th Varga, para 81

[3] Cf Antagaḍadasāo, 3rd Varga.

attaıned the hıghest object (Bh. 162, M 478, S 73-75) Cılāıputta was a pıous monk endowed with ascetic virtues, by the smell of blood ants swarmed on him and began to bite his head, his body was rendered porous like a seive, though he was bitten thus, he bore no ill will, and thus attained knowledge and the highest object (Bh 88, M 427-30, S 86) The king Java was saved from death by a portion of verse, and he became a successful monk then what to say of the efficacy of the Sūtras preached by Jina (Bh 87)? That devotee of Parivrājakas (Harivāhana by name) offered hot food to a recluse in a pot placed on the back of a pious banker Jiṇadhamma of Kāñcanapura[1] The hot pot took out a patch of flesh etc Disgusted with the world the banker became a monk He abstained from all food and stood facing each direction for one fortnight His wound was annoyed further by birds, worms etc, but he tolerated all that quietly taking that to be the fruit of his Karmas and less troublesome than the tortures of hell At the end of two months he fell dead paying respects to Jinas (M 412-423) Desire for pleasures degrades one, while indifference to the same rescues one from Samsāra the two brothers (Jinapāliya and Jinarakkhiya)[2] who met a goddess and a god (on an island) are an illustration in this context (Bh 147) Danda was endowed with ascetic virtues, when he stood practising some penance, he was pierced with arrows, being concentrated on the words of Jina, he was indifferent to the body, he endured the pain, and attained the highest object (M 465, S 61-62) One who is heretical and hates the saints suffers terribly here like that Datta of Turumini (Bh 62, M 491?) The devotion unto Jina results into happiness and birth in a good family like that Daddura[3] of Rāyagiha who was formerly Maniyārasetthi (Bh 75) The saint Damadanta, though blamed and praised by Kauravas and Pāndavas, maintained the attitude of equality (M 442) Devarai, the king of Sākeya, lost his kingdom and its pleasures, and was thrown into the river by his queen who was attached to a lame man (Bh 122) The two monks, Dhanna and Sālibhadda, that were endowed with penancial glory, submitted themselves to Prāyopagamana on a pair of stone-slabs near Vebhāra mountain in the vicinity of Nālandā, they had no attachment for their bodies which withered with cold and heat, and they reached Anuttara region, through divine grace their bone-heaps can be marked out even to this day (M 443-48) At Pādaliputta of Candayagutta, there was one Dhammasīha who abandoned Candasiri and adopted religious life at Kallaūra, he practised Grdhra-prstha[4] Pratyākhyāna peacefully, he was indifferent to the body though eaten by thousands of worms, and consequently he attained the highest object (S 70-72) Nanda, Paraśurāma, Pāndurārya and Lobhananda perished on account of anger, vanity, treachery and greed respectively (Bh 153) Five members of a family at Ayalaggāma, viz, Surai, Saya, Deva, Samana and Subhadda, humbly waited upon a monk, Khamaga by name, who was penance-worn, and accepted from him the vows of a house-holder after hearing his discourses on Punya and Pāpa Later they entered the ascetic order in the religious regime of Vāsupūjya They practised various severe penances and were born in the Aparājita-vimāna Thence they were born as the victorious sons of Pāṇdu in the Bhārata country Hearing the sad news of Krsna's death, they got themselves admitted to the order under the monk Sutthiya The eldest mastered fourteen and the rest eleven Pūrvas,

[1] See the story of Saṇankumāra given by Nemicandra in his commentary on the Uttarādhyayana, XVII, gāthā 37, pp 239-40 of Śrī-Uttarādhyayanāni, Bombay 1937

[2] Cf Nayādhammakahāo, chap IX, p 18 above, the story of Māyandi princes

[3] Nāyādhamma, chap XIII

[4] This is one of the seventeen types of death

and they became famous all over the world They came to Suraṭṭha, and hearing about the Nirvāna of Jina [Nemi], they adopted fast Bhīma practised rigorous austerities, adopted Prāyopagamana on the mount Śatrumjaya, tolerated every trouble, and reached Parinirvāna. The rest of them also followed him (M 449-64) Even a Pāna (i e, cāndāla) could get divine attendance, when fallen in a crocodile pond, by virtue of his having observed the vow of Ahimsā only for a day (Bh 96) There should not be any attachment, even for a second, towards kinsmen and relatives, because it is they that become enemies like that mother in the case of Brambhadatta (M 376) The pupils of the Arhat [Mahāvīra] were burnt by Mankhali[1] with his penancial lustre, being thus burnt, they attained the highest object (S 88) The queen Miyāvaī destroys within a moment the Karman of her past lives by Vandanā and other rites (Bh 50) Possession or attachment is dangerous the saint Meyajja, along with the Krauñca bird (?), was oppressed by a house-holder when the wealth was really taken by his son[2] Out of sheer compassion he did not expose the Krauñca bird which was a culprit, and when his eyes were pierced, he remained firm like the Mandara mountain (Bh 133, M 425-6) That wicked Menṭha, who was sent to the gallows for theft, offered salutation to the Jina [at the moment of his death] and was born as a Yaksa, Kamaladala by name (Bh 78) Thirty-two members of the club Lalıyaghadā at Kosambī faced courageously the flood of the river, submitted themselves to Prāyopagamana and attained the highest object (S 79-80, M 480?) The saint Vaīrarisī had a band of five hundred pupils, he stood courageously in the sun on a slab of stone performing his penance, tender as he was, his body melted as it were like a lump of ghee, the place where he was worshipped by gods is known as Rahāvattagiri, and the mountain where Indra honoured him became famous as Kuñjarāvatta (M 468-73) A single lie vitiates many truthful words by telling a lie but once Vasu went to hell (Bh 101) The fourth sovereign [Sanamkumāra] suffered from sixteen diseases for a period of seven thousand years, but he tolerated all of them (M 410-11) After a fast for four months, on the day of fast-breaking, when he was steady in his vow and while he was coming down the mount, the saint Sukosala was strangled by this mother, now born as a tigress, at Cittakūda on the Muggillagiri, he tolerated patiently all that and attained the highest object (Bh 161, M 466-67, S 63-64) The ignorant cow-boy uttered piously the Namaskāra-mantra, and was born consequently as a merchant-prince Sudamsana at Campā (Bh 81) The monks from the low caste, Somadatta etc, of Kosambī, were thrown into the sea when they had submitted themselves to Prāyopagamana (M 493) Due to pure Samyaktva, i e, Right faith, though not accompanied by conduct, Harikulaprabhu, Śrenika and others were destined to be born as Tīrthakaras (Bh 67) Sodāsa suffered being a slave of taste, and the king Somāliya, of the sense of contact (Bh 145-6)

The above survey is partial and does not include all the references from the Paīnnas There are some Kathānakas which are anonymously introduced (M 424, 510 etc), and there are others which give some names without sufficient details (M 433) I have tried to note the contents of the verses with utmost caution, because it is difficult to interpret them without already having a close acquaintance with the Kathānakas In some cases it is hard even to spot the proper names A story from the Diṭṭhivāya has been summarised (M 512-520), but the crucial names are not properly indicated To illustrate how different Parīsahas or hardships, of which we get an account in the Uttarādhyayana, chap II (M.

[1] Cf Bhagavatī, Śataka XV

[2] Possibly there are two versions of the same story

484), were endured by the ascetic heroes of the past, various names are mentioned, but the text gives very few biographical details (M 485-503 etc)

This bird's-eye-view of the narrative sections from the Ardha-māgadhī canon reveals to us certain broad traits The legends are associated mainly with three Tīrthakaras, Nemi, Pārśva and Mahāvīra the majority with Mahāvīra and minimum with Pārśva In all the legends connected with Nemi, Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva figures quite prominently, and they get closely linked with what we call Harivamśa The tales belonging to the age of Mahāvīra give good many details about contemporary dynasties and kings Though they are didactic in spirit, it is quite apparent that some characters are historical persons As remarked above, some legends are specifically Jaina, while some are special editions of common Indian legends with ethico-religious bias of Jainism

Some evidence is preserved in the canon itself as to how these pattern-stories etc, were kept in traditional memory Almost all of them stand at present in prose, but in some places the series of names are put in the form of a verse Further Uvāsagadasāo gives a few verses which must have served a good aid to memory of the teachers who gave the stories in details when the occasion arose The commentaries on the texts like the Nāyādhammakahāo give pithy verses summarising and explaining the motive of the stories It is difficult to say whether these verses are the later summaries of the present texts or the texts themselves have such verses at their basis Though the first alternative is not altogether excluded, I feel inclined to accept the second alternative as a general rule The entire narrative of the Samarāiccakahā was presented by Haribhadra on the basis of a few verses which too have come down to us Such verses do presuppose stories in oral tradition, but they themselves lie at the basis of the written compositions available at present

b) Post- and Pro-canonical strata etc

The next stratum of Jaina literature, which deserves special attention in the survey of early narrative tale, is represented by Nijjuttis[1] that are something like commentaries which not only explain a few topics connected with the text with which they are associated by the application (*ni-yuj*) of Anuyoga-dvāras etc, but also supplement the information by giving the accessory details There are Nijjuttis on ten canonical texts Some independent Niryuktis like the Piṇḍa-, Ogha- and Ārādhanā- are there the first two appear to be the supplements of Daśavaikālika- and Āvaśyaka-niryukti, while the last is known only from a reference[2], and it appears probable that it might have been absorbed in texts like the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā, Maranasamāhi[3] etc More than once the legendary environments of a certain discourse are given by the Niryukti for instance, it is the Niryukti that gives details about Ārdraka (in the Sūyagadam) who held a debate with Gosāla etc, as noted above The Niryuktis themselves have many significant contexts and references

[1] On the Niryuktis the following sources may be studied Leumann Daśavaikālikasūtra and Niryukti, ZDMG, 46, pp 581-663, and Ubersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literature, Hamburg 1934, Ghatage The Daśavaikālika-, and Sūtrakṛtāṅga-niryukti, Indian H Quarterly, vol XI, 4 and vol XII, 2, Charpentier Intro, pp 48-52, of Uttarādhyayana, Uppsala 1922, Chaturavijayaji Anekānta III, pp 678-684

[2] Mūlācāra V 82, p 233, ed Māṇikachandra D J Granthamālā No 18, Bombay Saṁvat 1977

[3] The concluding gāthās of Maraṇasamāhi are very significant and interesting This work has inherited ideas, and possibly verses also, from eight earlier texts 1) Maraṇa-vibhatti, 2) Maraṇa-visohi, 3) Maraṇasamāhi, 4) Samlehaṇāsuya, 5) Bhatta-pariṇṇā, 6) Āurapaccakkhāṇa, 7) Mahāpaccakkhāṇa, and 8) Ārāhaṇāpaiṇṇa

which necessitated the subsequent Cūrṇīs, Bhāṣyas and Tīkās to give elaborate Kathānakas for a clear and full explanation. A few examples may be noted. The Uttarādhyayana-niryukti refers to Dhanamitra, Hastimitra, Svapnabhadra etc., to illustrate how bravely they faced different *parīṣahas* which are twenty-two in number, similar stories are found in other contexts too. Daśavaikālika-ni., in course of the exposition of Udāharaṇa, gives important references (verse 61 etc.) which presuppose, if not written, at least oral Kathānakas. In other contexts (verses 77, 81, 87, 162, 239 etc.) either proper names are mentioned or significant catch-words are given which become meaningful only when the legends are added in details. Even the Nandīsūtra gives certain verses, perhaps of a traditional nature, which enumerate illustrative terms *sela-ghana* etc., to characterise good and bad pupils, and these have occasioned elaborate stories. As yet we have no clear idea about the early sources of these Kathānakas. It appears from certain references that some Kathānakas were present in the Dṛṣṭivāda, which is lost now, and the details of such a Kathānaka of an elephant are mentioned in the Maranasamāhi Paīnna (verses 512-20). The Āvaśyaka-ni is a pretty important text, or at least it has been given that importance by some of the extensive commentaries written by celebrated authors. The text affords many occasions for introducing Kathānakas, say in applying Anuyogas, in illustrating Buddhis, in the context of correct reading of the text etc.[1] Consequently the Cūrnī, Bhāsya and Tīkā have been replete with Kathānakas, both in Prākrit and Sanskrit, and the total bulk of these stories is of staggering magnitude.[2] Leumann has already summarised the stories on the Daśavaikālika-ni and edited separately a few stories from the Āvasyaka-cūrni and Haribhadra's Tīkā.[3] Besides consistently giving a complete account of the stories already referred to in the canonical texts, the commentators like Haribhadra, Śīlānka, Śāntyācārya, Devendra, Malayagiri and Abhayadeva have not only drawn upon earlier commentaries but also on extraneous literature with the result that their commentaries have become repositaries of Jaina tales of varied length and various interests. In this context mention may be made of Uvaesamālā, a poem in 540 Prākrit verses, attributed to Dharmadāsa who is claimed to be a contemporary of Mahāvīra. Critical scholars are not ready to assign such an antiquity to this text. Apart from the didactic remarks in pithy and concise expression, this work is a rich mine of legendary references many of which are already met with in the Painnas. It is often quoted and has been subjected to good many commentaries since 9th century A.D. as far as we know. The work looks like a compilation, and the basic verses may go back to an earlier stratum of Jaina literature corresponding to Nijjuttis and Paīnnas.

The Digambaras have not accepted the present Ardhamāgadhī canon to be authoritative for them. Though the early canon is lost, the Digambara tradition has preserved the lists of canonical texts with their sub-divisions, if any, and contents. It is interesting to compare them with those given in the Nandīsūtra and with the classification of the Ardhamāgadhī canon as it is current today. The absence of the Upānga division both in the Nandīsūtra enumeration and the Digambara classification and certain common details indicate the genuineness of the Digambara tradition which is earlier than the Valabhī Council. According to the Digambara tradition, Jñātṛdharmakathā or Nāyādhammakahāo

[1] Śrī-Viśeṣāvaśyaka, with Gujarati translation, parts 1-2, Āgamodayasamiti, Bombay 1924-7, pp. I, 509, II, 513 etc.

[2] The volumes of Bṛhatkalpasūtra, five of which are already out (Bhavanagar 1933-38), are rich in illustrative narratives.

[3] Daśavaikālika-sūtra and -niryukti ZDMG, 46, Leipzig 1892. Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen, Leipzig 1897.

narrates various Ākhyānas and Upākhyānas, Antayada describes Nami, Rāmaputra etc ; and Anuttaropapādikadaśā or Anuttaradasā contains narratives about Ṛsidāsa, Dhanya, Sunaksatra, Kārtika, Nanda, Nandana, Śālibhadra, Abhaya, Vārisena, Cilātaputra etc [1] Stories about some of them are available in the present Ardhamāgadhī canon, but in the absence of early texts it is not possible to say what the Digambara stories were like Perhaps the only available fragments of the Digambara canon lie at the basis of those three big commentaries which, in their final shape, are known by the names Dhavalā, Jayadhavalā and Mahādhavalā [2] The portions, so far published, are comparatively small, and the context being purely technical, one is not in a position to have any idea of the Kathānakas, if found at all, in these works Some of the illustrative stories, such as those which classify and characterise the pupils, are also found here The next stratum of the early Digambara literature consists of the works of Kundakunda, Yativrsabha, Vattakera and Śivārya Among the works attributed to Kundakunda, the Nirvānakānda is a formula of recitation which enumerates many celebrities in the Jaina tradition with the places of liberation, and salutations are offered to them It gives a good idea of the early capital of Jaina mythology and of the personalities held in reverence by the Jainas The Bhāvapāhuda refers to certain personages who suffered on account of some blemish in their bhāva or spiritual temperament [3] Bāhubali's spiritual progress was hindered by his vanity, even though he had no attachment for his body On account of Nidāna, the saint Madhupinga could not be a monk, and the saint Vasistha suffered misery (44-46) Bāhu, though a Jaina monk, burnt the town of Dandaka due to internal hatred and fell into the Raurava-hell, so also Dīpāyana, though a monk in appearance but devoid of real merits, wandered in infinite Samsāra (49-50) Śivakumāra, though encircled by young ladies, could put an end to Samsāra because of his heroic and pure mind Bhavyasena could not be a Bhāvasramana (i e , an ascetic with bhāva), even though he had learnt 12 Angas and 14 Pūrvas, nay the whole of the scriptural knowledge, while Śivabhūti, whose bhāva was pure, attained omniscience by simply uttering *tusa-māsa* (51-3) Even the fish Śālisiktha, due to impurity of mind, fell into a great hell (86) To illustrate that mere knowledge devoid of Śīla does not pave the path to higher worlds, the Śīlapāhuda quotes the instance of Surattaputta[4] who, though knowing ten Pūrvas, went to hell (30) The Tiloyapannatti[5] of Yativrsabha gives all the basic details that have constituted, in later works, the biographies of 63 Śalākāpurusas Similar details are found in the Āvaśyaka-bhāsya etc The Mūlācāra of Vattakera records (II 86-7) that Mahendradatta killed women like Kanakalatā, Nāgalatā, Vidyullatā and Kundalatā and also men like Sāgaraka, Vallabhaka, Kuladatta and Vardhamānaka on the same day in the town of Mithilā On this verse the commentator Vasunandi has not given any details of the story, but simply remarks *kathānikā cātra vyākhyeyā āgamopadeśāt* Then to illustrate how alms were procured by certain monks through anger,

[1] See Prākrit Śrutabhakti, Pūjyapāda's Sarvārthasiddhi on the Tattvārthasūtra I 20, and Akalanka's Rājavārtika on the same, Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama with Dhavalā (Amraoti 1939) vol I, pp 96 etc , Gommaṭasāra, Jīvakānda (Bombay 1916) pp 134 etc

[2] Prof Hiralal has fully compared the details about the Dṛṣṭivāda available in the Digambara and Śvetāmbara texts in his Introduction, pp 41-68, to Dhavalā, vol II (Amraoti 1940)

[3] Upadhye Pravacanasāra (Bombay 1935), Intro , p 33

[4] The Sanskrit Chāyā, supplied possibly by the editor, equates this name with Sātyakiputra

[5] A portion of this was tentatively edited by me (Jaina Siddhānta Bhavana, Arrah 1941, first printed in the Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara and then separately issued) Now it is again being reedited by me and it is in the Press The text is accompanied by a Hindi translation

vanity, deceit and greed, the text refers to some stories associated with the towns of Hatthikappa[1], Venāyada, Vāṇārasī and Rāsiyāṇa Vasunandi has not given any details, but merely remarks *atra kathā utprekṣya vācyā iti* In the next verse (VI 36) Yaśodhara is mentioned as a typical Dānapati The Bhagavatī Ārādhanā of Śivārya, though it deals mainly with the ascetic discipline on the eve of a monk's death, contains many legendary references which are already developed, as we shall see below, into Kathānakas collected in the Kathākośas of Harisena, Prabhācandra etc The text refers to many eminent personalities who deserve to be remembered on account of their religious piety, sinful acts and ascetic heroism or forbearance with their consequences here and elsewhere[2] Many of the names are common with the Painnas, and some of them are mentioned in almost identical verses

On account of almost identical contents dealing with monastic life, common verses showing minor changes of verbal and dialectal nature, and similar method of exposition and presentation, the conclusion appears to be inevitable that texts like the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā, Mūlācāra, Nijjuttis (like Āvassaya, Pinda etc) and Paīnnas (like the Marana-samāhī, Bhattaparinnā etc), in some portions at least, go back to a common source that was once accepted as authoritative both by the Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras The dialectal and verbal differences rule out the possibility of mutual borrowing at a later date after the texts were fixed in writing, in fact, they clearly indicate how the same verse, without the contents being affected, has been subjected to minor changes in course of oral transmission The preservation of identical broad outlines of contents only goes to confirm the authenticity of the early Jaina tradition and the fidelity with which it has been handed down to this day Behind the differences, elaborated in later days, between the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras, a dispassionate study reveals a solid and common background of Jaina tradition ascetic ideals are fundamentally the same in spirit, and the same ascetic heroes are celebrated by them

Among the early Digambara Śrāvakācāras, The Ratnakarandaka of Samantabhadra mentions Añjanacora[3], Anantamatī, Uddāyana, Revatī, Jinendrabhakta, Vārisena, Visnu and Vajra to illustrate how the eight limbs of Samyaktva, *nihśankā* etc , were worthily possessed by them respectively (I 19-20) Then Mātanga, Dhanadeva, Vārisena, Nīlī and Jaya are known for their perfect observance of the five Anuvratas, and Dhanaśrī, Satyaghosa, Tāpasa, Āraksaka and Śmaśru-navanīta are noted for their five sins (III 18-9) Lastly, the names of Śrīsena, Vrsabhasena and Kaundeśa are mentioned as typical donors (IV 28) Vasunandi in his Uvāsayajjhayana[4] illustrates the eight Angas of Samyaktva with almost the same names as those given by Samantabhadra he gives Jinadatta for Jinendrabhakta and in addition mentions the names of their towns also (verse Nos 52-5) Vasunandi illustrates the consequences of the seven Vyasanas by appealing to the following stories Due to gambling the king Yudhisthira lost his kingdom and had to dwell in the forest for a period of twelve years, Yādavas perished by drinking foul wine when they were

[1] Jitakalpabhāṣya (Ahmedabad Sam 1994) mentions an illustration of Khamaga of Hatthikappa but more details are not given (gāthās 1395 etc)

[2] These facts are noted in more details later

[3] The Yaśastilakacampū (Śaka 881), 6th Āśvāsa, also gives these stories The Dharmāmṛta (in Kannada) of Nayasena (A D 1112) gives stories associated with Samyaktva, Vratas etc

[4] I have used an edition which gives Prākrit text and Hindi translation The face page is gone, possibly it was published from Devaband by Babu Surajabhan Vakil

thirsty while sporting in the garden, the demon Baka of Ekacakra, being addicted to flesh-eating, lost his kingdom and went to hell after death; that intelligent Cārudatta, because of his contact with a prostitute, lost his wealth and suffered a good deal in the foreign country, the sovereign Brahmadatta went to hell on account of his sin of hunting, because he repudiated a deposit, Śrībhūti was punished and he wandered miserably in Samsāra; the lord of Lankā, though a semi-sovereign and a king of Vidyādharas, went to hell, because he kidnapped another's wife, and Rudradatta of Sāketa, being addicted to all the seven Vyasanas, went to hell and wandered long in Samsāra (verse Nos. 125-33)

These texts by themselves give very little information about these names, and it is for the commentators to supply the details Prabhācandra, for instance, has given the stories to make the references of the Ratnakaraṇḍaka intelligible Most of these stories, it is clear, are moral lessons, some of them are found in later Kathākośas, and the fate of the heroes and heroines in the story leaves a definite imprint on the pious readers If they suffer by their sins, the reader is expected to abstain from similar acts, and if they reach happiness by their pious acts, the reader becomes a confirmed believer in those virtues

A thorough study of the extensive Jaina Kathānaka or narrative literature alone would help us to identify the stories and get more details about the names casually mentioned in the wide range of early Jaina literature some specimens of which have been passingly surveyed above This much is certain that no writer would refer to names like this unless he has definite stories in view either in oral tradition or in written records The fact that some stories have been traced with the necessary details means that further studies are needed to connect these names with the well-established tales

c) Later Tendencies and Types

After taking this passing survey of the narrative elements in early Jaina literature, it is possible to take stock, with typical examples, of the growth of subsequent Jaina narrative literature from the earlier seeds We are concerned more with the types and their broad traits than with detailed particulars about each work

The material for the lives of 63 Śalākāpuruṣas (24 Tīrthankaras, 12 Cakravartins, 9 Baladevas, 9 Vāsudevas and 9 Prativāsudevas) is found partly in the Kalpasūtra and, in its basic elements, in the Tiloyapaṇṇatti and Viśesāvaśyaka-bhāsya as we have seen above These lives have assumed a definite pattern, though the extent of details and descriptions etc , differ from author to author It appears that some earlier works, like that of Kavi-Parameśvara, have not come down to us, but the works of Jinasena-Gunabhadra and Hemacandra in Sanskrit, those of Śīlācārya and Bhadreśvara in Prākrit, of Puspadanta in Apabhramśa, of Cāmundarāya in Kannada and the Śrīpurāna of an anonymous author in Tamila are available besides the minor compositions of Āśādhara, Hastimalla etc On account of their cosmographical and dogmatic details, intervening stories and moral preachings, they are worthily classed among the eminent Purāṇas and held in great authority

In the second type we have the biographies of individual Tīrthankaras and other celebrated personalities of their times We have seen how Nirvāṇakāṇḍa offers salutations to many an eminent soul commemorated in later literature Most of the available biographies of Tīrthankaras, whether in Prākrit, Sanskrit, Kannaḍa or Tamila, admit the traditional

details, but present them in an ornate style following the models of classical Kāvyas in Sanskrit the lives of Supārśva and Mahāvīra depicted by Lakṣmanagaṇi[1] and Gunacandra in Prākrit, those of Dharmanātha and Candraprabha in Sanskrit by Haricandra and Vīranandi, and those of Ādinātha, Ajita and Śānti in Kannada by Pampa, Ranna and Honna are good examples Jaina tradition puts Rāma and Kṛṣna as contemporaries of Munisuvrata and Neminātha, and there are many works giving the Jaina version of the Indian legends about Rāma and Krsna or cycles of tales associated with them The Paümacariya of Vimala and the Padmacarita of Ravisena, even after making concession for the Jaina background and outlook, do give original and important traits of the Rāma-legend, though they do not conceal their acquaintance with Vālmīki's Rāmāyana Due to the introduction of Vidyādharas and their feats, these texts give a pleasant reading like a fairy tale in many portions Krsna Vāsudeva figures in Jaina literature quite prominently the Ardhamāgadhī canon gives good bits of information about him and his clan, he is an outstanding hero of his age, but the traces of deification, so overwhelmingly patent in the Mahābhārata, are conspicuously absent throughout these references In early Jaina works Pāndavas are not as important as they appear to be in the Mahābhārata, and Krsna, though not a divinity, is a brave and noble Ksatriya hero Perhaps this represents an earlier stage in the evolution of the Pāndava legend which, in its enlarged and sectarian form, is available to us in the present-day Mahābhārata The Vasudevacarita attributed to Bhadrabāhu has not come down to us, but the Vasudevahindi of Sanghadāsa, describing the peregrinations of Vasudeva and representing a fine Jaina counterpart of the Brhatkathā of Gunādhya, is a memorable storehouse of a lot of heroic legends, popular stories, edifying narratives extended over many births, and sectarian and didactic tales Many of the Ākhyānas, such as those of Cārudatta, Agadadatta, Pippalāda, Sagara princes, Nārada, Parvata, Vasu, Sanamkumāra etc , which are so popularly repeated in later literature, are already there in the Vasudevahindi nearly in the same form The stories like that of Kadārapinga, who is well-known as a voluptuous character, can be traced back to this text, the motive remains the same, though the names associated with the story are different The Harivamśapurāna of Jinasena in Sanskrit and that of Dhavala in Apabhramśa share a good deal of common ground with the Vasudevahindi Jinasena's text, it is remarkable, presents many details which can be more fittingly relegated to a work dealing with the lives of 63 Śalākāpurusas Under this type may be included hundreds of Jaina works, in prose or poetry, in various languages some of them deal with the lives of individual religious heroes such as Jīvandhara, Yaśodhara, Karakandu, Nāgakumāra and Śrīpāla, then there are edifying tales of pious house-holders and ladies that devoted their life to the observance of certain vows and religious practices, there are short biographies of ascetic heroes well-known in early literature, and lastly, there are tales of retribution, illustrating the rewards of good and bad acts here and elsewhere What matter in these stories are the motives and the doctrinal preachings Some heroes are drawn from earlier literature, some from popular legends, and some names may be even imaginary the setting, however, given to all these is legendary This category includes many Kathās, Ākhyānas and Caritras in Sanskrit, Prākrit or Apabhramsa, their authors mind only the narration of the events and their style is epical There are some notable examples like the Gadyacintāmani, Tilakamañjarī, Yaśastilakacampū etc , which are fine specimens of high poetic ability and ornate expression It is an essential qualification of a Jaina monk that he should be able to narrate various stories,

[1] He narrates a number of sub-stories illustrating the fruits of Samyaktva and of the Aticāras of twelve vows, and they almost eclipse the main current of the narrative

naturally many Jaina monks, gifted with poetic inclinations, have richly contributed to this branch

The third type marks an interesting path in Indian literature it is the religious tale presented in a romantic form The Tarangavatī of Pādalipta in Prākrit is lost, but its later epitome the Taraṅgalolā, shows that it might have possessed engrossing literary qualities Then there is the Samarāiccakahā which is a magnificent prose romance composed by the poetic and literary genius of Haribhadra almost from a string of traditional names to illustrate how Nidāna or remunerative hankering involves the soul into long Samsāra The Upamitibhavaprapañcā kathā of Siddharsi is an elaborate allegory worked out with much skill and care, and can be put under this type Sometimes imaginary tales have been made an excuse for attacking the other religions, their doctrines and mythology This tendency is explicitly seen as early as the Vasudevahindi, but the ways adopted there are straightforward Haribhadra's Dhūrtākhyāna and the Dharmaparīksās of Harisena, Amitagati and Vrttavilāsa have shown how skilfully the incredible legends of Hindu mythology could be ridiculed through an imaginary tale

The fourth type is represented by semi-historical Prabandhas etc After lord Mahāvīra, there flourished patriarchs, remarkable saints, outstanding authors, royal patrons and merchant-princes who served the cause of Jaina church in different contexts and centuries The succeeding generations of teachers have not allowed all these to fall into oblivion We see how Nandīsūtra offers salutations to eminent patriarchs, Harivamśa and Kathāvali mention the various teachers after Mahāvīra, and the hymns like the Rsimandala enumerate the names of saints all these elements have given rise to a large mass of literature in later centuries, and the Pariśistaparvan, Prabhāvakacarita and Prabandhacintāmani are the typical examples It is true that the historian has to glean out facts from their legendary associations Like the great teachers, the Jaina holy places also are glorified in works like the Tīrthakalpa

The last type is represented by compilations of stories or the Kathākośas We have seen how some of the canonical texts, Niryuktis, Paīnnas, Ārādhanā texts etc , refer to illustrative and didactic stories, exemplary legends and ascetic tales Other texts like the Uvaesamālā, Upadeśapada etc , do continue this tendency This required the commentators to supply these stories in full sometimes older Prākrit stories are preserved in Sanskrit commentaries, and at times the commentators themselves wrote these stories, based on earlier material, in Sanskrit either in prose or verse or in a mixed style This has made some of the commentaries huge repositaries of tales, and we know how rich in stories are the various commentaries on the Āvaśyaka, Uttarādhyayana etc These stories have got a definite moral purpose to be propagated, and as such teachers and preachers could use them independently, without any specific context, throughout their discourses There have been the Jaina recensions like the Pañcākhyāna which were the forerunners of the Pañcatantra This gradually led to small and big compilations of Kathās which could be conveniently used as source-books for constant reference Many teachers could narrate them in their own way keeping intact, as far as possible, the purpose and the frame of the story Consequently we have today in Jaina collections a large number of Mss called Kathākośas Many of them are anonymous compositions, and very few of them are critically inspected in comparison with others of that class Works like the Kumārapālapratibodha are nothing but collections of stories meant for a specific purpose Individual stories from these collections are available separately also As distinguished from

these didactic tales, there are some stories associated with Vratas or the religious and ritualistic practices, and a good tale is composed to glorify the fruit of Vratas and the persons who achieved it In later days they have lost all literary flavour and become mechanical and prosaic narratives which are often preserved in collections also

In all the above types of works, excepting some of the semi-historical Prabandhas, certain traits specially attract our attention, because they are not quite normal and not found in such an abundance in other branches of Indian literature Pages after pages are devoted to the past and future lives, and the vigilant and omnipotent law of Karman meticulously records their pious and impious deeds whose consequences no one can escape Whenever there is an opportunity, religious exhortations are introduced with dogmatical details and didactic discourses The tendency of introducing stories-in-stories is so prevalent that a careful reader alone can keep in mind the different threads of the story Illustrative tales are added here and there, being usually drawn from folktales and beast-fables, and at all the contexts the author shows remarkable insight into the workings of human mind The spirit of asceticism is writ large throughout the text, and almost as a rule every hero retires from the world to attain better status in the next life

3 COMPILATIONS OF KATHĀNAKAS A SURVEY

In various Bhandāras we come across a large number of Mss which are collections of stories, and their names are available to us from catalogues like the Brhattippanikā,[1] Jaina Granthāvali[2] and Jinaratnakośa[3] The last work is the most up-to-date and exhaustive Catalogus Catalogorum so studiously prepared by Prof H D Velankar The following list is mainly based on that work, the advance-formes of which, thanks to the kindness of the Author and Publishers, I have been allowed to use Without a thorough examination of the Mss it is difficult to distinguish one Kathākośa from the other, so I have noted specially those works which could be mutually distinguished and about which some specific information could be noted afresh.

Kathākośa (Kathānakakosa or Kathākośa-prakaranam) It is in Prākrit containing 239 gāthās according to the Brhattippanikā In the opening gāthā the author declares that he would preach some Nāyas, illustrations or exemplary tales, which are the cause of liberation The verses only mention the stories with catchwords sometimes stories more than one are associated with a certain illustration The fourth gāthā, for instance, says that the soul earns heavenly bliss even by *pūjā-pranidhāna* (desire for or thought about Pūjā or worship) like Jinadatta, Sūrasenā, Śrīmālī and Roranārī In the first 17 gāthās, which portion alone is studied by me, the stories refer to Jinapūjā and Sādhudāna[4] The Sanskrit commentary on these gāthās gives the illustrative stories in Prākrit, the presentation being an admixture of prose and verse Prof Jinavijayaji informs me that Jineśvara-sūri, the pupil of Vardhamāna-sūri, himself has composed the gāthās as well as the stories in

[1] Jaina Sāhitya Samśodhaka vol II, part 2

[2] Published by the Jaina Śvetāmbara Conference, Bombay Samvat 1965

[3] To be published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 4

[4] One Kathākośa is attributed to Haribhadra (Jaina Sāhityano Itihāsa p 168), but it has not come to light as yet

their present form, though it is not unlikely that he might have incorporated earlier material.[1] He quotes canonical passages and stray verses in Sanskrit, Prākrit and Apabhramśa[2]

Kathākośa It is a collection of 27 tales (beginning with the story of Dhanada and ending with that of Nala) illustrating the fruits of worship and other pious duties and religious virtues, the effects of four passions and the consequences of ascetic observances[3] According to Tawney's estimate, these stories are genuine fragments of Indian folk-lore, but they have been edited by some Jaina theologian for the purpose of the edification of the votaries of that religion, and they are, in their present form at any rate, intended to illustrate the tenets and practice of Jainism It is written in Sanskrit interspersed with Prākrit gāthās The name of the author is not known, nor can we assign any definite date to this work Three names of kings, Karka, Arikesarin and Mammana, mentioned in this work, are traceable to the royal dynasties of Karnāṭaka in the 10th and 11th centuries A D , and from these references Dr Saletore[4] observes thus 'it may not be unreasonable to conclude that the work may have been composed after the last quarter of the eleventh century A D '

Kathākośa (Kathāratnakośa) It was composed at Broach in Samvat 1158 (-57=1101 A D), the author being Devabhadra, the pupil of Prasannacandra According to the doctrine of Jina, the path of liberation is sustained by the good monk and the good householder, well-versed in their respective duties A good monk is not possible without his being a good householder he who can practise the partial course of conduct is able to practise the full one To become a good householder one has to be endowed with general (sāmānya) and special (visesa) virtues the former are 33 in number and refer to right-faith and eight Angas, religious devotion, devoted support of the institutions of the temple and monkhood, and the cultivation of philanthropic, noble and gentlemanly traits of character, the latter comprises 17 virtues referring to the practice of five Anuvratas, seven Śiksāvratas, some of the Āvaśyakas with Samvarana and renunciation Corresponding to these virtues, exemplary stories are given by this Kathākośa in Prākrit with stray verses in Sanskrit here and there It is written mostly in verse, there being a few prose passages Religious and didactic instruction through stories is the main purpose of this composition, and they are expected to influence the reader and turn him into a well-behaved householder[5]

Kathākośa (Bharateśvara-Bāhubali-Vrtti) of Śubhaśīla *Bharahesara-Bāhubali* are the opening words of a Prākrit composition in 13 verses, perhaps a part of daily salutation, enumerating a century of great personalities, 53 men (beginning with Bharata and ending with Meghakumāra) and 47 women (Sulasā to Renā) who have been well-known for their accomplishments in their religio-ascetic duties Most of them are the characters from

[1] Peterson (Reports IV, p xliv) remarks 'Composed, Samvat 1092, in Āśāpalli a Līlāvatīkathā and in Diṇḍiyānakagrāma a Kathānakakośa' According to Mr Desai (Jaina Sā Itihāsa p 208), he composed Kathākośa between Samvat 1082-1095 Bṛhaṭṭippaṇikā puts Samvat 1108 So this Kathākośa can be assigned to the second quarter of the 11th century Winternitz (HIL p 543) puts 1092 A D perhaps he mistook Samvat for A D

[2] The work is in the press at present, and I am thankful to Śrī Jinavijayaji who kindly sent to me thirteen advance formes

[3] This Kathākosa is translated into English by C H Tawney, Oriental Translation Fund, New Series II, London 1895

[4] Jaina Antiquary (Arrah 1938) vol IV, No 3, pp 77-80

[5] Thanks to Śrī Jinavijayaji who kindly supplied me with a few advance forms (covering 90 folios) of this work which is in the press

the stories and exemplary tales narrated and referred to in early Jaina literature some tract of which is already reviewed above They are to be met with in texts like the Sūyagadam, Bhagavaī, Nāyādhammakahāo, Antagada, Uttarajjhayana, Painnas, Āvassaya- and Dasaveyāliya-nijjutti and their commentaries The Prākrit verses give simply a string of these names, and in the beginning they must have been quite significant to those who were well-versed in the wide range of Jaina literature Later on, the need of exhaustive commentaries utilising the original sources and giving the stories in details was gradually felt Śubhaśīlagani, the pupil of Munisundara of the Tapāgaccha, has written a Sanskrit commentary giving the stories in prose and verse interspersed with Prākrit quotations here and there The Vrtti being entirely made up of stories, it is called Kathākośa, and it was composed in Samvat 1509[1] Śubhaśīla shows a special aptitude for narrative composition Besides his other works, he has written Pañcaśatīprabodhasambandha[2] which 'contains nearly 600 stories, anecdotes, legends, fables, fairy-tales etc , some of which allude to historical personages, kings and authors of both ancient and modern times, such as Nanda, Śātavāhana, Bhartrhari, Bhoja, Kumārapāla, Hemasūri and others'

Kathākośa (Vratakathākośa) of Śrutasāgara[3] in Sanskrit It contains stories about the Vratas, religious courses and vows consisting of rituals and fasts, such as Ākāśapañcamī, Mukutasaptamī, Candanasasthī, Astāhnika etc The author belonged to Mūlasangha, Sarasvatī-gaccha, Balātkāra-gana, and Vidyānandi was his teacher He has not given his date, but from the external evidence he can be assigned to the 16th century of the Vikrama era He has given a few stories in his Sanskrit commentary on the Pāhudas of Kundakunda

Kathākośas[4] Some Mss labelled as Kathākośa are available in the Government Collection at the Bhandarkar Oriental R Institute, Poona No information is available about their authors, nor is it possible to state, at this stage, their source, their literary basis or their connection with other Kathākośas I have casually inspected them just to see what they are like, and I note here a few facts about them 1) No 1266 of 1884-87, foll 47, incomplete It opens with a salutation to Candraprabha, and gives in Sanskrit the stories of Ārāmatanaya, Harisena-Śrīsena, Jīmūtavāhana etc 2) No 1267 of 1884-7 This gives the stories which are usually called Samyaktvakaumudī-kathā The opening prose is slightly different and runs thus गौडदेशे पाडलीपुरनगरे आर्यसुहस्तिसूरीश्वरा । त्रिषण्डभरताधिपसम्प्रतिराज्ञोऽग्रे धर्मदेशनां चक्रुरेवं, भो भो भव्या etc The concluding story is that of Dhanapati illustrating Pātradāna Though written in Sanskrit, some Prākrit verses are given here and there 3) No 1268 of 1884-87 This gives stories in Prākrit illustrating the fruits of worship with Gandha (by Śubhamati etc), with Dhūpa (by Vinayamdhara) etc The colophons and some portions are in Sanskrit It is written at Sārangapura by Harsasinghagani 4) No 1269 of 1884-87 The Ms is mutilated and very badly written It gives stories of Amaracandra (with reference to *bhāvanā*), of Vikramāditya (to illustrate *pāramārthika-maitrī*) etc , in Sanskrit prose and verse The Vetālapañcavīśī is quoted on p 19, and there are some small stories in Apabhramśa and Old-Gujarātī It ends with a fable possibly from the Pañcatantra 5)

[1] It is published in the Devachand Lālabhāi Pustakoddhāra Series, Nos 77 and 87, Bombay 1932 and 37

[2] Peterson's Reports, III, p cxxi, Winternitz HIL, II, p 544, etc

[3] Premi Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, pp 406-11

[4] Various Ārādhanā-kathākośas will be reviewed later

No. 582 of 1884-86 There are Sanskrit verses followed by illustrative stories some of which are Prabandhas about Jinaprabhasūri, Jagasimha, Sātavāhana, Jagaḍūsāha etc. 6) No 583 of 1884-86 It is mutilated on both the sides It is in Sanskrit prose with Sanskrit and Prākrit quotations, and possibly it contains the stories of the Samyaktva-kaumudī 7) No 1324 of 1891-5 It is mutilated and incomplete There are stories about Prasannacandra, Sulasā, Cilātīputra etc, in Sanskrit prose mixed with verses 8) No 1323 of 1891-95 In Sanskrit prose mixed with Sk and Pk verses, it gives stories of Devapāla (in connection with Devapūjā), Bāhubali (to illustrate the effect of Māna), Aśokadatta (to illustrate deception), Madanāvali (with reference to sandal-worship) etc Sometimes the stories open with Prākrit verses No 1297 of 1887-91 also begins like this and some stories too are common The verse *vasahī* etc (No 240) from the Upadeśa-mālā is the basis of some tales 9) No 1322 of 1891-95 The stories of Madanarekhā, Sanatkumāra etc, are given in Sanskrit interspersed with Prākrit and Apabh verses 10) No 478 of 1884-86 The first three folios give Harisena's Kathākośa Then follows an Apabh work giving Kathās, something like 53 in number, that deal with Vratas like Sugandhadaśamī, Sodasakārana, Ratnāvalī (in Sanskrit), Nirdoṣasaptamī etc There are a few more Kathākośas attributed to the authors like Vardhamāna, Candrakīrti, Simhasūri, Jayatilaka, Sakalakīrti, Padmanandi, Rāmacandra[1] etc, but their Mss have not been accessible to me

Kathānaka-kośa The author is Vinayacandra[2], and it contains 140 gāthās in Prākrit. The text gives the name Dhammakkhānaya-kosa The Pattan Ms, which is accompanied by a Sanskrit Vyākhyā, is dated Samvat 1166

Kathāmani-kośa (Ākhyānamani-kośa) it is composed in Prākrit verses by Devendra-gani, alias Nemicandra, who finished his Sukhabodhā commentary, well-known for its Prākrit stories[3], on the Uttarādhyayana, in Samvat 1129 (1073 A D) Devendra is famous for his lucid style, so the Mss of this bulky work, in 41 chapters, deserve to be studied with reference to the contents A Sanskrit commentary on this work is written by Āmradeva, the pupil of Jinacandra, in Samvit 1190, just sixty years after the composition of the Kośa[4]

Kathāmahodadhi. The Karpūraprakara[5] or Sūktāvalī of Hari or Harisena is a didactic poem containing 179 Sk verses of lengthy metres, and deals with Jaina religious and moral principles which as enumerated by the author himself are 87 in number It is indeed a rare thing that one is born as a man with religious surroundings, gets the necessary instruction, practises the Jaina virtues by eschewing all internal and external hindrances,

[1] At the Nayā Mandira, Delhi, there is a Punyāsrava-kathākośa in Sanskrit There is a similar work in Kannaḍa composed by Nagarāja in 1331 A D In all there are 52 stories, illustrating the religious virtues like Puja etc, by narrating the biographies of Bharata, Karakaṇṭa, Yama, Cārudatta, Sukumāra, Sitā etc, and they are divided into twelve Adhikāras It is written in a Campū style, and the author says that it is based on a Sanskrit work (Kavicarite I, pp 409-12) This Kannaḍa work is translated into Marāṭhi Ovis by Jinasena in Śaka 1743 (+78=1821 A D)

[2] Catalogue of Mss at Pattan, vol I (Gaekwad's O Series No 76), p 42

[3] Some of them are edited by Jacobi in his Ausgewählte Erzahlugen in Māhārāṣṭrī, Leipzig 1886, and it has been translated into English under the title 'Hindu Tales' by Meyer (London 1909), see also Prākṛta-kathāsamgraha ed by Jinavijayaji, Ahmedabad

[4] See Charpentier's Intro to his ed of Uttarā (Uppsala 1922), pp 56 etc., also Peterson's Report IV, p. 59 of the Index of authors, Report III, p 78 etc

[5] The text opens with the words *karpūra-prakara* and hence its name.

and finally gets liberation Every step of this preaching is nicely put and explained with relevant illustrations We are told, for instance, how Neminātha practised Jīva-dayā which led to his spiritual benefit and how Rāvana suffered because of his attachment for another's wife Every verse refers to one or more legends by way of illustration As we come to the close of the book, there are more moral exhortations than legendary references The author Hamsena was a pupil of Vajrasena, and the date of composition is not settled as yet

It was left for the commentators to give the stories in all their details, and the number of such tales, short or long, is narly 150[1] The Kathāmahodadhi, composed in Samvat 1504 by Somacandra, the pupil of Ratnaśekhara, gives all the stories Jinasāgara, the pupil of Śrīvarddhanasūri of the Kharataragaccha, has written a Karpūra-prakara-tīkā [2] The dates available for him are Samvat 1492 to 1520, so he is a contemporary of Somacandra He explains the verses and then gives the illustrative stories, usually in Sanskrit verses, which are often introduced with Prākrit passages, both in prose and verse, from the canon and works like the Upadeśamālā I have not been able to verify the relation of these stories with those in the Kathāmahodadhi the titles of the stories and their order are the same These illustrations include the tales about Śalākā-purusas like Nemī, Sanatkumāra etc , historical and semi-historical persons like Satyaki, Celanā, Kumārapāla etc , ascetic heroes like Atimuktaka, Gajasukumāra etc , and other pious men and women connected with Jaina tradition

Kathāratnasāgara It contains fifteen Tarangas and the last story is that of Agadadatta The author is Naracandrasūri[3], the pupil of Devabhadrasūri The Pattan Ms is dated Samvat 1319

Kathāratnākara It is in Sanskrit, and its author is Uttamarsi The available Ms is incomplete stopping with 2nd Khanda It includes the story of Rukminī to illustrate the effects of Sādhunindā[4]

Kathāratnākara It is composed in Samvat 1657 by Hemavijayagani, the pupil of Kamalavijaya of the Tapāgaccha As the author remarks, some of the stories are traditionally heard, some are imaginary, some are compiled from other sources, and some are taken from scriptures There are 258 stories distributed over ten Tarangas Most of them are written in simple Sanskrit prose, very few are composed in a heavy style, and only a few are metrical narratives Each story opens with one or more moralising verses which contain the central idea of it Throughout the work, quotations in Sanskrit, Māhārāstrī, Apabhramsa, Old-Hindī and Old-Gujarātī are found in plenty, and some of them are well-known to us from the epics, Bhartrhari's Śatakas, Pañcatantra etc The Jaina outlook of the work is explicit in some of the opening stanzas, ideas and stories It covers a wide range of ideology from the erotic to the ascetic Winternitz remarks 'Most of the narratives are similar to those in the Pañcatantra and other books of stories of this kind, tales of the artfulness of women, tales of rogues, tales of fools, fables and fairy-tales, anecdotes of all descriptions, including some which hold up Brahmans and other

[1] For a list of these Kathās see Peterson Reports III, pp 316-19

[2] Published by the Jaina-Dharmaprasāraka-sabhā, Bhavnagar 1919, see also the Catalogue of the Bombay Branch of the R A S by H D Velankar, vols III-IV, Nos 1705 and 1798

[3] Catalogue of Mss at Pattan, vol I, p 14

[4] Peterson Reports IV, p 80

holy men to scorn As in the Pañcatantra there are numerous wise sayings interspersed with the tales The tales are, however, loosely strung together, and not inserted into a frame' The work, in its major portion, is really Indian in outlook Besides the names quite usual in Jaina works, we meet with anecdotes connected with Bhoja, Vikrama, Kālidāsa, Śrenika etc Some of the topographical references are quite modern, and stories are associated with towns like Delhi, Champaner and Ahmedabad On the whole the contents are instructive as well as amusing[1]

Kathārṇava The Isimandala or the Ṛṣimandala-stotra of Dharmaghosa (*c* 13th century A D) is a Prākrit poem containing 208 to 218 verses offering salutations to Jaina celebrities including Śalākāpurusas and their great contemporaries devoted to religious life, Pratyeka-buddhas, legendary heroes like Jinapālita, ascetic heroes like Metārya, and eminent post-Mahāvīra teachers about whom casual biographic details are mentioned Most of them are found in the canonical texts, Niryuktis and Prakīrṇakas What appeared like legendary characters from a didactic tale, an edifying story or a narrative parable are treated here almost as ascetic heroes or actual personalities belonging to the Jaina church It was incumbent on the commentators to explain these verses by giving the biographies of persons referred to in the Stotra More than half a dozen Vrttis are available on this text the Ms of the earliest is dated Samvat 1380 and that of the latest Samvat 1670 Pattan Collection has got a Brhadvrtti in Prākrit on this text The Vrtti of Padmamandira of the Kharataragaccha is called Kathārnava (-ankā), and it was composed in Samvat 1553 or A D 1496 It explains the verses and gives all the stories in Sanskrit verses usually Anustubh[2] Some verses of the text (for instance Nos 154-160, opening of the third Amśa) are pronounced by Padmamandira as *parakrta* or later additions

Kathāvalī This is a huge work in Prākrit prose written by Bhadreśvara, and so far there is only one Ms of it at Pattan The date of the Ms is Samvat 139 (the last cipher is broken off) according to Jacobi, but according to Dalal it is Samvat 1497 Dalal assigns Bhadreśvara to the reign of Karna (1064-94 A D), while Jacobi would identify this author, in all probability, with one Bhadreśvara in the 2nd half of the 12th century of the Samvat era in any way this work is to be put earlier than the Pariśiṣtaparvan of Hemacandra It narrates the account of 63 Śalākāpurusas and includes also the lives of eminent teachers from Kālaka down to Haribhadra So far as this second section is concerned Hemachandra stops with Vajrasvāmin while Bhadreśvara's list comes upto Haribhadra 'The collection of the materials', Jacobi remarks, 'for the whole history of the patriarchates was achieved, probably for the first time, by Bhadreśvara' whose 'tales are, as a rule, but a more elegant version of the Kathānakas contained in the Cūrnis and Tīkās ' Having noted some difference regarding the composition between the works of Bhadreśvara and Hemacandra, Jacobi[3] says 'Bhadreśvara's work has few literary merits It is scarcely more than a collection of disconnected materials for the history of the Śvetāmbara church culled from the

[1] Published by Hiralal Hamsaraja, Jamnagar 1911, translated into German by Hertel, München 1920, also see Winternitz HIL, II, p 545

[2] See Śri Ṛṣimaṇḍala-prakaraṇam, Ātmavallabha-granthamālā, No 13, Valad 1939, especially its Introduction, Jaina Granthāvali, p 175, Catalogue of Mss in Jesalmere Bhandars, p 14, No 126, Baroda 1923, Catalogue of Mss at Pattan vol I, p 118, etc

[3] See the Intro to the Sthavirāvalīcarita 2nd ed by Jacobi, Biblio Indica, Calcutta 1932, and Catalogue of Mss at Pattan, vol I, pp 56, 244

ample Literature of Cūrṇis and Tīkās The Kathāvalī compares unfavourably with the Sthavirāvalīcarita by Hemacandra which reads like a connected history of the patriarchate from Jambū down to Vajrasena, told in fluent Sanskrit verses and spirited Kāvya style. No wonder that it superseded the older work to such a degree that for a long time the Kathāvalī seemed to be lost, till but lately one single Manuscript was brought to light'.

Kathāsamāsa (Upadeśamālā-) It is already noted above how Uvaesamālā contains many references to religious personalities etc, about whom stories in Prākrit are given in this work composed by Jinabhadra whose date and identity are still indefinite[1] There are other compilations of these stories in Sanskrit one is by Sarvanandi and another is anonymous[2] Not only the commentators gave the stories, but it was also usual to compile independent collections of stories referred to in a certain text just as Jinabhadra has done here with regard to the Upadeśamālā The stories connected with the Uttarādhyayana, Śīlopadeśamālā, Bhagavatī Ārādhanā etc, are also separately compiled[3]

Kathāsamgraha (also Antara-, or Kathākośa) The author is Rājaśekhara Maladhāri, the pupil of Tilakasūri of the Harsapurīyagaccha, who can be assigned to the middle of the 14th century A D, his Prabandhakosa being composed in Samvat 1405 The stories are written in simple Sanskrit prose, quite in a conversational style, the expression being often contaminated with vernacularisms Sanskrit, Māhārāstrī and Apabhramśa verses are profusedly quoted throughout Most of the stories are introduced with a verse laying down a maxim, edifying a virtue, preaching a piece of good behaviour or suggesting a way of tactful action, and then the stories follow almost to explain the ideas contained in the opening verses In many cases, the style, format and contents remind us of the Pañcatantra The author has in view a twofold aim in composing this work some 86 stories are primarily meant for instruction, ethical and religious, and the remaining 14 are meant for amusement by their wit and humour The text shows this division, but the contents are not mutually exclusive The topics covered by the illustrative stories include all sorts of worldly wisdom, and some of them definitely bear the stamp of Jaina religion and moral code Though the motives are often handled by others, it is quite likely that most of the stories are imaginary and made to order Some of them are drawn from the popular stock of Indian tales, and a few, like the illustration of Rohaka, have been drawn from the Jaina commentarial literature whose roots go back to Cūrnis and Bhāsyas The alternative title, Antara-kathā, possibly means that these stories were repeatedly used as illustrative sub-stories, like Upakathās, in a bigger tale[4]

There are a few more Kathāsamgrahas, noted in the Jinaratnakośa, either they are anonymous or we do not know much about their authors etc 1) KS of Hemācārya 2) KS of Ānandasundara 3) KS of Sarvasundara (Samvat 1510), successor of Gunasundarasūri of the Maladhārigaccha 4) KS, No 1272 of 1884-87 (dated Samvat 1524), contains many short didactic stories in Sanskrit dealing with topics like Jīvadayā This is a good sample of collections of stories that were possibly used by monks to illustrate their sermons 5) KS, No 1326 of 1891-95, has much common with the Kathākośa No 1297 of 1887-91,

[1] Catalogue of Mss at Pattan, vol I, p 90

[2] See Mss Nos *1271* (Bhandarkar V) and *1325* of *1891-95*

[3] Catalogue of Mss in the Bombay Branch R A S by Velankar (Bombay 1930), Nos 1417, 1703, 1665, and see Ārādhanākathākośas below

[4] Śri-kathākośaḥ, Sūryapura 1937, with useful Indices of quotations etc, there is a Ms in the Bhandarkar O Research Institute, No 1298 of 1887-91, which shows a different beginning from that of the printed text

and gives stories of Dhanadatta, Nāgadatta, Madanāvalī etc, to illustrate the fruits that they got by different Pūjās etc 6) KS, No 1325 of 1891-95 This gives eight tales, in Sanskrit prose, about Kurucandra, Padmākara etc, illustrating the fruits of the gift of residence, bed, seat, food, drink, medicine, clothes and pot to the monk, which are mentioned in the gāthā *vasahi-sayanāsana* etc, (No 240) from the Upadeśamālā 7) KS, No 335 of 1871-72 The opening story is that of Vikramāditya, and there are other stories of Śrīpāla etc, illustrating the fruits of Jaina vows and virtues. They are all in Sanskrit with Māhārāstrī and Apabhramśa quotations There is, however, one story in Prākrit

There are other collections of stories, according to the Jinaratnakośa, such as Kathākallolinī, Kathāgrantha, Kathādvātrimśikā of Paramānanda, Kathāprabandha, Kathāśataka, Kathāsamcaya, Kathāsamuccaya etc Unless the Mss are carefully examined, nothing can be said about their contents and about their identity or otherwise with the Kathākośas noted above

4 ĀRĀDHANĀ AND ĀRĀDHANĀ TALES

i) Ārādhanā and Ārādhanā Texts

Ārādhanā consists in firm and successful accomplishment of ascetic ideals, namely, Faith, Knowledge, Conduct and Penance, that are laid down in Jainism, in maintaining a high standard of detachment, forbearance, self-restraint and mental equipoise at the critical hour of death, and in attaining spiritual purification and liberation[1] The connotation of the term Ārādhanā covers a wide range of dogmatical and ethico-religious discussion to which small and big texts have been devoted The subject is undoubtedly of immense interest to a monk who wants to win the spiritual battle, naturally both ancient and modern authors have composed works dealing with the Ārādhanā topics The Mūlācāra, as noted above, refers to the Ārādhanā-niryukti, but the text has not come down to us Among the ten Painnas, Āurapaccakkhāna, Mahāpaccakkhāna, Bhattaparinnā and Maranasamāhi deal with this topic in its different aspects The Bhagavatī Ārādhanā is a big work entirely devoted to the discussion about Ārādhanā It belongs to the earliest stratum of Digambara literature, Painnas and Nijjuttis have much common with it, and undoubtedly they contain much matter that antedates the division of the Jaina church into Digambara and Śvetāmbara Before we take up the study of Bha Ā in more details, we will enumerate here, mainly on the authority of the Jinaratnakośa, different Ārādhanā texts with some information about their authors and contents

Ārādhanā It is composed about Samvat 1629 by Ajitadevasūri, pupil of Maheśvarasūri of the Cāndragaccha[2]

Ārādhanā (Śrāvaka-) It is composed in Samvat 1669 by Samayasundara, pupil of Sakalacandra of the Kharataragaccha

Ārādhanā (Paryanta-). It is written by Somasūri in 70 Prākrit gāthās, and is often included in the list of Prakīrnakas. It is commented upon by Vinayavijayagaṇi and by Vinayasundaragani (Samvat 1649)

[1] Bhagavatī Ārādhanā 1-10, *Samayasāra 301-5*, *Maraṇasamāhi 27, 41, 317 etc*, *Ārādhanāsāra 1-8*

[2] Desai Jaina Sāhityano Itihāsa, p 585

Ārādhanā (Pañcaka-) It is a pretty big text in Prākrit dealing with fourfold Ārādhana.[1]

Ārādhanā The Jinaratnakośa records a couple of anonymous texts one is in Prākrit, beginning with *panamiya narinda-devinda-vandiyam*, and the other is composed in Samvat 1592

Ārādhanā-kulaka Four texts of this name are recorded The first begins with *āloyanovayāram*, has got 85 gāthās, and is composed by Abhayadevasūri,[2] the famous commentator who flourished in the middle of the 11th century A D , the second begins with *dānāi-cauvviha* and is also called Samārādhanā-kulaka, the third, noted by Peterson, contains 69 gāthās,[3] and the fourth contains 17 gāthās and opens with *savvam bhante pānāim*

Ārādhanāpatākā· This contains 990 gāthās and was composed by Vīrabhadrasūri in Samvat 1078 (*atthuttarime samā-sahassammi*) The author admits his indebtedness to earlier works, and the text contains many gāthās common with Bhattaparinnā, Pindanijjutti and other works Being a dated work its text and contents deserve a critical comparison with other Ārādhāna works

Ārādhanā-prakarana There are two texts of this name, one by Yaśoghosa and the other by Somasūri containing 61 gāthās[4]

Ārādhanā-mālā (usually called Samvegarangaśālā) It is a bulky Prākrit work which, according to the Jaina Granthāvali, contains 10053 slokas[5] It deals with Ārādhanā in its four principal and fortythree subsidiary topics Some of the gāthās are written in a fluent style The author is Jinacandrasūri, the pupil of Jinesvarasūri He composed this Mālā at the request of his junior fellow-student (*satīrthya*), Abhayadeva, the famous Vrttikāra, after collecting the expressions from the Mūlaśruta like a florist picking flowers from a park It was finished in Samvat 1125 (-57=1068 A D) It is said to have been revised by Jinavallabha, the pupil of Abhayadeva The doctrinal discussion includes along with it some illustrative stories as well This work is respectfully mentioned by many authors Some of the significant words from the opening gāthā of the Bhaga Ārādhanā appear to be scattered in some of the opening gāthās of this book (Nos 5, 14), secondly, some of the names of the subsidiary topics are common to both the works, and lastly, a gāthā (No 800), which is introduced with the phrase *gurur āha*, is nearly identical with gāthā No 21 from the Bha Ā It is not unlikely, if Jinacandra used Śivakoti's text, but it is premature to be dogmatic on this point From what little I have seen it appears to me, however, that a comparative study of these two works would give interesting results

Ārādhanāsāra This Prākrit text of Devasena, who finished his Darśanasāra in Samvat 990, contains 115 gāthās and deals with fourfold Ārādhanā[6] There is a good Sanskrit commentary on this text by Ratnakīrti who gives a few details about himself in his Prāśasti His date is not settled, but a critical study of his quotations may help us to put

[1] Catalogue of Mss at Pattan vol I, pp 303, 391 etc

[2] Peterson Reports IV, p iii, etc

[3] Reports III, p 24

[4] Catalogue of Mss at Pattan vol I, p 65

[5] Jesalmere Catalogue, pp 38, 21 (No 183), only a portion is printed so far in the ed Śrī Samvegaraṅgaśālā, part I (gāthās 3053 with Sanskrit Chāyā), Surat 1924

[6] Māṇikachandra D Jaina Granthamālā, No 6, Bombay Saṁvat 1973

an earlier limit for his age After a casual survey I find that he quotes from the Ātmānuśāsana of Guṇabhadra, Samayasāra-kalaśa of Amṛtacandra, Jñānārṇava of Śubhacandra, Sāmāyika of Amitagati and Ekībhāva of Vādirāja etc

There are many other texts dealing with Ārādhanā, but we do not know much about their authors and contents, so I shall simply note their names with scanty details 1) Ārādhanāratna by Devabhadra 2) Ārādhanāvidhi 3) Ārādhanāśāstra of Devabhadra, the pupil of Abhayadeva noted above (possibly identical with -ratna?)[1] 4) Ārādhanāsattarī[2] by Kulaprabha in Prākrit 5-8) Ārādhanāsāras of Ravicandra, Jayaśekhara, Nāgasena and Lokācārya 9) Ārādhanāstava[3] (of Amitagati or Āśādhara?) 10) Ārādhanāsvarūpa.

This large number of Ārādhanā texts, early and modern, whatever may be their intrinsic value, shows the importance of the doctrines associated with Ārādhanā in the life of Jaina monks A detailed and comparative study of these texts would certainly give valuable results

ii) Bhagavatī Ārādhanā

The Bhagavatī Ārādhanā[4] is a pretty lengthy text containing nearly 2170 (but Bombay ed , 2166) verses in Prākrit or more correctly Jaina Śaurasenī The commentaries are not in perfect agreement about the original extent Aparājita has some additional gāthās (Nos 151, 343, etc) which are not admitted by Amitagati and Āśādhara, while there are many gāthās[5] (Nos 117-9, 178, 1354, 1432, 1556, 1605-7, 1639-40, 1978, 2111, 2135 etc), which are explained by Āśādhara though he specifically mentions that they are not commented upon by Śrīvijaya alias Aparājita Thus the extent of the text is not definite, and a systematic collation of Mss alone would bring all the facts to light Āśādhara divides the whole work into eight Āśvāsas, but it is entirely his own proposal for which there is hardly any sanction either in the basic text or in Aparājita's commentary A careful and continuous study of the gāthās clearly reveals that the whole work has a compact form and that the contents are systematically presented The very nature of the subject-matter, however, is such that sporadic verses may be added or omitted here and there without affecting the frame-work of contents This work is devoted to a detailed exposition of four-fold Ārādhanā which a monk must cultivate at least at the critical hour of death if not all through his life

After an introductory discourse on the Ārādhanā (Nos 1-24), the text says that there are seventeen kinds of death[6] of which five would be discussed in this work and the last

[1] Desai Jaina Sāhityano Itihāsa, p 237

[2] Peterson Reports III, p 13

[3] See Mūlārādhanā (Sholapur 1935), pp 1865 etc

[4] There are two editions 1) Bhagavatī Ārādhanā in the Anantakīrti D Jaina Granthamālā, 8, Bombay Sam 1989, the text is accompanied by a Hindī translation and the edition is equipped with a good introduction and an Index of gāthās 2) Mūlārādhanā with the Sk commentaries of Aparājita and Āśādhara, the metrical paraphrase of Amitagati and a modern Hindī translation, Sholapur 1935

[5] My references are either to the gāthā-numbers or to the pages of the Sholapur edition

[6] Aparājita has elaborately described them, the details may be compared with those in the Uttarādhyayana-Niryukti which also enumerates and describes these seventeen types (p 5 of the Ms No 1094 of 1887-91, from the Bhandarkar O R I , Poona)

three alone are commendable (25-30) *i*) Bāla-marana (31-53), *ii*) Bālābāla- (54-63) *iii*) Paṇḍita- which has three varieties *a*) Bhaktapratyākhyāna (64-2029), *b*) Ingin (2029-2061), and *c*) Prāyopagamana (2062-77), *iv*) Bālapaṇḍita- (2077-87) and *v*) Panditapandita- (2087-2159) Then there are the concluding remarks along with the Praśasti of the author (2160-70) The three varieties of the Pandita type have much in common, and all the instructions, which are conducive to the spiritual welfare of the monk, are included under Bhaktapratyākhyana-section which is treated under forty topics (Nos 64-70), 1) *arha*[1] fitness for adopting the course of Samādhi-marana (71-76), 2) *linga* necessary ascetic emblem such as nudity etc (77-98), 3) *śikṣā* scriptural study (99-111), 4) *vinaya* disciplined devotion to knowledge etc (112-131), 5) *samādhi* concentration of mind (132-141), 6) *aniyatavāsa* unsettled residence (142-53), 7 *pariṇāma* dutiful and balanced temperament (154-61), 8) *upādhi-tyāga* minimum paraphernalia (162-70), 9) *śriti* spiritual ascendancy (171-76)[2], 10) *bhāvanā* cultivation of salutary thoughts (177-204), 11) *sallekhanā* emaciation of body and of passions through external and internal penances etc , (205-70), 12) *diśā* proclamation of the spiritual successor (271-5), 13) *kṣamāpanā* apology to the congregation, 14) *anuśāsana* pious instruction (279-83), 15) *paragana-caryā* staying with another ascetic group for Samādhi marana (384-400), 16) *mārganā* finding out a suitable Niryāpaka (401-16), 17) *susthita* a worthy teacher endowed with eight specific virtues (417-507), 18) *upasarpana* seeking admission under a Teacher (508-14), 19) *parīksana* test (515), 20) *pratilekha* reviewing or considering the situation (516-17), 21) *prcchā* inquiry (518), 22) *pratīpsanā* admittance (519-21), 23) *ālocanā* report of the sins committed (522-61), 24) *guna-dosa* defects and merits of the report of sins (562-632), 25) *śayyā* a fitting residence (633-39), 26) *samstara* bed (640-7), 27) *niryāpaka* the attendant ascetics that help one at the time of Samādhi-marana (647-88), 28) *prakāśana* showing the food to allay the curiosity (689-95) 29) *hāni* gradual abstention from solid food (696-9), 30) *pratyākhyāna* abstention from liquids etc , (700-9), 31) *ksāmanā* offering purificatory apology to the Acārya (710-13) 32) *ksapana* destruction of Karman by Pratikramana etc (714-19), 33) *anuśisti* instruction by the Acārya etc , on various religious topics and practices, ranging from the relinquishment of Mithyātva upto the practice of austerities (722-3), which are described in details (720-1489), 34) *sārana=smārana* reminding him of his status and duty (1490 1508), 35) *kavaca* religious instruction as a protection or armour against Parīsahas etc (1509-1682), 36) *samatā* attitude of equality (1683-98), 37) *dhyāna* meditation (1699 1905), 38) *leśyā* spiritual glow or tint (1906-23), 39) *phala* the fruit or the aim of Ārādhanā (1924-65), 40) *vijahanā* disposal of the body (1966-2000), and then this section is concluded with a few glorificatory gāthās (2000-29)

This topical analysis gives us not only a definite assurance of the systematic treatment of the subject-matter but also some glimpse of the wide range of contents covered by this work The discussion about Ārādhanā, which plays an important part on the eve of a Jaina monk's life, is carried on with such an exhaustive thoroughness that the book has

[1] The Samvegaraṅgaśālā of Jinacandrasūri discusses Ārādhanā in four primary Dvāras 1) Parikarmavidhi, 2) Paragana-samkramaṇa, 3) Mamatva-vyuccheda, and 4) Samādhi-lābha, each of which is further divided into 15, 10, 9 and 9 Pratidvāras respectively Some of their names are common with those of the topics from the Bhaga Ārādhanā They deserve to be studied in details

[2] Compare Jitakalpabhāṣya (Ahmedabad Samvat 1994) gāthā Nos 338-340, this work shows many sections with common ideas found in the Bha Ā

become a valuable mine of Jaina ideology with which a monk must be imbued in order to accomplish a successful ascetic life. On account of its dogmatic details, exposition of the basic principles of Jaina asceticism, practical injunctions about saintly life and the behaviour in details, extensive discourses on the mental, verbal and physical discipline of a monk advising him to follow the beneficial and warning him to abstain from the harmful and religio-didactic exhortations, this Bhagavatī Ārādhanā presents a rich survey of Jainism, especially with reference to the theory and practice of ascetic life The section on *anuśiṣṭi* (gāthās 720-1489) is a fine didactic work by itself Thus, for a Jaina monk, its importance is very great and its study simply indispensable The systematic exposition of contents in a simple and direct style and with homely similes and illustrations has left such an influence on later Jaina literature that, as far as I recall, many of the subsequent authors like Pūjyapāda, Gunabhadra, Śubhacandra, Amitagati and other didactic monk-poets have freely drawn their ideas from this work

The popular name of this work is Bhagavatī Ārādhanā, but the genuine title, according to the author himself is Ārādhanā (No 2166), Bhagavatī being only an honorific appellation added by the text to qualify the practice of Ārādhanā (Nos 2002-3, 2168) This is borne out by the following facts Ārādhanā-tīkā is the other name given to Śrī-vijayodayā by Aparājita himself, Devasena's compendium is called Ārādhanā-sāra, Amitagati calls his metrical Sanskrit version Ārādhanā (No 2245), also Bhagavati Ā , or simply Bhagavatī (Nos 2244, 2247), Prabhācandra mentions it as Mūlārādhanā in his Kathākośa possibly to distinguish it from Amitagati's Ārādhanā, and lastly Āśādhara also adopts the name Mūlārādhanā, because he calls his commentary M -darpana It must be noted that the sanctity and importance of the Ārādhanā have led to its being deified, and both Amitagati and Āśādhara have glorified and praised the Ārādhanādevatā (pp 1853, 1855, 1865 etc) That explains why Bhagavatī came to be inseparably associated with the title Ārādhanā

The author's name is Śivārya[1] who qualifies himself as *pāni-dala-bhoi*, i e , a monk that ate his food in the cavity of his palms He studied the scripture under Jinanandi, Sarvagupta and Mitranandi, and composed this Ārādhanā depending upon the work or composition of earlier Ācāryas (Nos 2165-6) This is all that we learn about the author from this text One Jinanandi is mentioned in the Altem copper-plates of *c* 488 A D ,[2] and one Sarvagupta is casually referred to by Śākatāyana in his Sanskrit grammar (1-3-140), but mere common names are not enough to establish identity between two authors I am not aware of any epigraphic reference to Śivārya There is not the least doubt that he is mentioned by Jinasena in his Ādipurāna (i 49) and by Śrīcandra in his Kathākośa (noted below) as Śivakoṭi The Śravana Belgoḷ inscription, No 105, dated 1398 A D , mentions one Śivakoti who was a pupil of Samantabhadra[3] and who ornamented (perhaps with a commentary) the Tattvārthasūtra It is about this Śivakoti a story is already narrated in the Kathākośa of Prabhācandra that he was originally a Śaiva king of Benares, was converted to Jainism by seeing a miraculous transformation of Śivalinga into the image of

[1] See also Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa by Pt Premi, pp 23-40

[2] Some doubt is expressed about the date, see IA, VII, pp 209-17, XXIX, pp 273-8, XXX, p 218, etc

[3] According to Hastimalla's remark in his Vikrāntakaurava, Samantabhadra had two pupils, Śivakoṭi and Śivāyana

Candraprabha, and became a Jaina monk As a Jaina monk, the story concludes[1], Śivakoti mastered the whole range of scriptural knowledge, summarised for the benefit of less intelligent and shortlived people the Ārādhanā of Lohācārya, containing 84 thousand verses, into a smaller compass, and composed Mūlārādhanā, containing 2500 verses and divided into forty topics such as *arha*, *linga* etc According to Prabhācandra, Śivakoti is identical with Śivārya, he is converted to Jaina faith by Samantabhadra, and he composed Mūlārādhanā as a digest of the bigger Ārādhanā of Lohācārya these are extremely interesting bits of information, but we do not know their earlier source As Prabhācandra's information is not confirmed by the present text of the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā which at the most admits that it is based on earlier works and as Aparājitasūri also is completely silent on these points, we cannot take it at the value of contemporary evidence and use it for chronological purpose We have to wait for still earlier sources Śivakoti's commentary on the Tattvārthasūtra has not come to light as yet The Ratnamālā[2] is a small didactic text containing 67 anuṣṭubh verses in Sanskrit and dealing mainly with the duties of a Jaina house-holder The colophon of the printed text attributes it to Śivakoti, the pupil of Samantabhadra, and the concluding verse indirectly mentions Śivakoti One Bhattāraka Siddhasena is mentioned (No 3) earlier than Samantabhadra who is solicited for grace (No 4), the contents breathe a modern spirit of later age and do not maintain the high ascetic standard of the Mūlārādhanā, and lastly it contains a verse (No 65) closely agreeing with one from the Yaśastilakacampū (part ii, p 373) these facts, taken together, do not induce one to attribute this work to the author of the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā

The evidence available for settling the date of Bha Ā is quite insufficient A more thorough study of the text in comparison with various other works may help us to put closer limits to the age of this work, at present, however, an attempt may be made to lay down certain broad limits All that we can definitely assert at present is that this work is earlier than Jinasena's Ādipurāna, but there are a few other considerations which shed some light on the early date of this work *i*) The Digambara tradition, as recorded by Prabhācandra, certainly admits the remote antiquity of this work by saying that it is based on the Ārādhanā of Lohācārya[3] and that its author was a contemporary of Samantabhadra, though this is not confirmed by the text itself *ii*) It is quite probable that this work includes the missing Ārādhanā Niryukti, the ideas and verses which it has in common (with dialectal and minor variations) with Nijjutti's,[4] Païnnas[5], Mūlācāra[6] etc, definitely

[1] As the text is not printed, I would quote here the relevant extract एतन्महाश्चर्यं दृष्ट्वा। शिवकोटिमहाराजस्य अन्येषां च तत्रत्यलोकानां जैनदर्शने महती श्रद्धा। परमविवेकसपन्न चारित्रमोहक्षयोपशमविशेषवशाच्च परमवैराग्यसपत्तौ राज्यं परित्यज्य तपो गृहीत्वा सकलश्रुतमवगाह्य लोहाचार्यविरचितां चतुरशीतिसहस्रसंख्यामाराधनां मन्दमत्यल्पायु प्राण्याशयवशाद् ग्रन्थत संक्षिप्य अर्थतोऽर्हे लिङ्गे इत्यादि चत्वारिंशत्सूत्रे परिपूर्णामर्धतृतीयसहस्रसंख्या मूलाराधनां कृतवानिति।

[2] It is printed in the Māṇikachandra D Jaina Granthamālā, No 21, Bombay Samvat 1979

[3] Lohācārya is one of the Aṅgadhārins, and according to the Paṭṭāvalis he might be assigned to the first half of the first century B C

[4] Compare the discussion about the seventeen types of death in the Uttarādhyayana-ni and that found in the Bha Ā, also cf Bha Ā No 32 with a similar verse in that Niryukti

[5] Compare Samthāraga Nos 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 111 and 115 with Bha Ā Nos 1561, 1562, 1669, 1670, 1667, 1538 and 108, cf Bhattaparinnā Nos 21, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, and 81 with Bha Ā Nos 408, 735, 737, 739, 738, 740, 741, 744, 746, 748, 749, 750, 755 and 759, cf Maraṇasamāhi Nos, 96, 97

suggest that this text contains matter which antedates the division of the Jaina Church into Digambara and Śvetāmbara; and it substantially represents the traditional verses collected by the Digambara monks who did not recognise the authority of the Ardhamāgadhī canon *iii*) The section on *vijahanā*, disposal of the body, prescribes certain practices which have an appearance of antiquity and which became obsolete in course of time The story of Dhanna and Sālibhadda[1] indicates that similar practices were in vogue and are recognised by the Śvetāmbara canon too *iv*) The text contains legendary references which breathe the same spirit as those in the Ardhamāgadhī canon, and some of them are expressed in almost identical words[2] Digambara tradition says that some of these stories were present in the canon which is lost beyond recovery *v*) This work had the honour of having a Prākrit commentary this corresponds to the spirit of the age of Cūrnis some of which are available on the texts of the Ardhamāgadhī canon, and this period lies a few centuries earlier than Vīrasena-Jinasena who not only incorporated Prākrit Cūrnis in their Dhavalā etc , but also began writing in a style mixed with Prākrit and Sanskrit *vi*) The method of exposition is mostly simple preaching of dogmas and didactic lessons with popular similies and illustrations, and has not as yet reached the stage of logical arguments and refutation seen in the works of Samantabhadra, Siddhasena and Jinabhadra etc Some of the discussions bear comparison with those in the Ardhamāgadhī canon *vii*) Lastly, the Prākrit dialect shows close affinities with the Ardhamāgadhī canon on the one hand and with the works of Kundakunda etc , on the other, and the commentaries explain certain queer forms as *ārṣa* (pp 108, 1429 etc) These considerations give an impression that the Bha Ā belongs to the earliest stratum of the pro-canon of the Digambaras consisting of the works of Vattakera, Kundakunda etc It is quite likely that Śivārya might be senior even to Kundakunda, but we have to await further researches I have put forth only my suggestions which require to be worked out in details after a more thorough study of the text

iii) Commentaries on the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā

In view of its contents, so important for one's guidance in the monastic life, and its antiquity, the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā is sure to have been subjected to many commentaries[3], the earliest of which that has come to light is the Śrīvijayodayā of Aparājitasūri It is an exhaustive commentary in Sanskrit full of information on ascetic duties and richly interspersed with Prākrit and Sanskrit quotations, some of the latter possibly composed by

98 99, 100, 101, 175, 176, 180, 185, 186 and 189 with Bha Ā Nos 538, 539, 540, 543, 546, 547, 206, 207, 248, 256, 257 and 260

[6] Comparing Mūlācāra with Bhaga Ā , I find more than sixty gāthās common I have incorporated the details in my paper on the Mūlācāra which is awaiting publication, see also the Varṇānukramaṇikā, p 725, of the Bombay ed of Bha Ā , and Anekānta Vol II, No 5 (Obviously I do not agree with the conclusion of Pt Paramanand)

[1] Maraṇasamāhi 443-48

[2] See for instance the references to Avanti-sukumāla, Cāṇakka, Cilādaputta, Jama (Java), Devaraí, Sukosala etc , are expressed in almost identical verses

[3] For earlier discussions about the commentaries see the following sources Premi Anekānta I, 4-5, Intro to the Bombay ed of Bhagavatī Ārādhanā noted above, and Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa pp 23-40; Jugalkishore Anekānta I 4, II 1, Hiralal Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara (Arrah) V, pp 129-34, Paramanand Anekānta II, 6, 8

the commentator himself[1] He notes alternative readings of the text (pp 225, 342, 489, 598 etc), and more than once he refers to and discusses the views of other commentators (pp 1, 23, 30, 33, 41, 56, 61, 105, 275, 1752, etc),[2] but their works have not been discovered as yet From the remarks of Āśādhara it is clear that Śrīvijaya was another name of Aparājita Vijaya and Aparājita mean the same, and the name of the commentary, Vijayodayā, possibly implies the author's name It appears from his casual remark (p 1196) that he had written a commentary of this very name on the Daśavaikālika According to the Praśasti, he was a crest-jewel of Ārātīya[3] monks, a grand-pupil of Candranandi and Mahākarmaprakrtyācārya, and a pupil of Baladevasūri He had studied under Nāganandi at whose instance he composed this commentary These facts are too meagre to help us either to settle his date or the place of activity[4] In some of the inscriptions these names are individually met with, but as they stand isolated, we cannot identify them with those in the Praśasti If it is accepted that Candranandi and Candrakīrti are interchangeable names, then I have in view a group of inscriptions[5] which mention one Śrīvijaya who had another name Pandita Pārijāta and who could be compared with Hemasena with regard to his learning and austerities He had predecessors Candrakīrti and Karmaprakrti by name Śrīvijaya flourished earlier than Āśādhara who finished his commentary on the Anagāradharmāmrta[6] in Samvat 1300 (-57=1243 A D) in which there are references to Aparājita (pp 166, 673 etc) Karmaprakrti is a rare name, and in all probability Śrīvijaya and the inscriptions refer to one and the same monk This would mean that the age of Śrīvijaya is slightly earlier than A D 1077, that being the year of an inscription, even if we hesitate to accept Śrīvijaya's identity[7] with others of that name Turning to the internal evidence, Aparājita is acquainted with texts like Ācārānga, Sūtrakrtānga, Kalpa, Daśavaikālika etc of the Ardhamāgadhī canon (pp 2, 611, 1130, 1196 etc), further he quotes from the works of Kundakunda, the Tattvārthasūtra of Umāsvāti, Svayambhūstotra (No 83) of Samantabhadra (p 1306), Sarvārthasiddhi of Pūjyapāda and the Varāngacarita (VII 26, I 13) of Jatila (pp 243, 258, 747) whom I have assigned to the close of the 7th century A D[8] This certainly means that Aparājita is later than 7th century Till more definite evidence comes forth, he might be put in the 8th to 10th century

The next exhaustive commentary is the Mūlārādhanā-darpana of Āśādhara[9] who carefully notes the number of gāthās in different sections, though his āśvāsa-division of the text is not quite satisfactory He closely follows Aparājita (p 68 etc) whom he refers to as Śrī-vijaya (-ācārya) and Ṭīkākāra (pp 797, 1047, 1442, 108, 150, 1043, etc) and whose

[1] It is necessary that these verses should be alphabetically arranged and seen whether any of them are found in the works of Raviṣeṇa, Jinasena, Vīranandi, Asaga etc

[2] These page-numbers refer to the Sholapur ed noted above

[3] For the explanation of the primary significance of this word see Sarvārthasiddhi of Pūjyapāda on the T sūtra I 20, and Indranandi's Śrutāvatāra, verse No 84

[4] Pt Premiji's suggestion that Aparājita belonged to the Yapanīyasamgha deserves respectful consideration, but we might wait for some positive and direct proof see Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa pp 41-60

[5] EC VIII, Nagar Nos 35-37, Tirthahalli No 192, IV, Nagamangal 100, V, Channarayapattana 14[?] Belur 17, Arsikere 1, II, No 54 (or No 67, 2nd ed), VI, Kadur 69

[6] Published in the Mānik D Jaina Granthamālā, No 14, Bombay 1919

[7] About other Śrivijayas see Karnāṭaka Kavicarite I, p 13 (Bangalore 1924), S Shrikantha Sastri on the dat of Jambūdvipaprajñapti, Jaina Antiquary (Arrah 1938) IV, pp 81-84

[8] Manika D Jaina Granthamālā No 40, Bombay 1938

[9] About Āśādhara and his works see Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, pp 129-49

commentary he mentions as Ṭikā or Samskrta-tīkā (pp 420, 440, 744, 779 etc) It is quite likely that he has in view some other Samskrta-ṭīkākāras than Śrīvijaya (pp 297, 1343, 1746, especially the phrase *iti tīkākārau vyācakratuh*) Besides, Āśādhara repeatedly refers to a Prākrta-tīkā (pp 643, 744, 763, 779, 1085, 1290, 1632, 1755 etc), but as far as I have seen the name of its author is not mentioned In one or two places Aparājita writes in Prākrit in continuation of his Sanskrit commentary (p 355), and it looks quite likely that he might be reproducing from an earlier Prākrit commentary Āśādhara quotes some Tippanakas (pp 779, 1737 etc); and two authors of these Tippanakas, Jayanandi (pp 1755-6) and Śrīcandra (pp 773, 793, 1834), are specifically mentioned by him More than once he takes cognizance of anonymous views (pp 1021, 1632 etc) Amitagati's metrical Ārādhanā in Sanskrit is already there before him (pp 339, 392, 528, 1333 etc), some of his quotations, however, which closely agree with the gāthās of Śivārya but differ from Amitagati's rendering, indicate the possibility that there was another metrical Ārādhanā in Sanskrit (pp 84, 397, 473, 485, 575, 1021, 1037, 1045, 1747 etc) Of chronological interest are some of his quotations from the Tattvānuśāsana (Nos 89-95) of Rāmasena (pp 1534-35) and Jñānārnava (p 1690) There is a quotation on p 1093 from Siddhyanka, i.e, the Bharatesvarābhyudaya of Āśādhara himself, of which no Ms has come to light as yet, and texts like Siddhāntaratnamālā (p 1195), Vidagdhaprīti-vardhanī (p 1291), from which he quotes, are new names of works which are still to be discovered It is true that he quotes verses (V 4, IV 150 etc) from his Dharmāmrta (Anagāra-) in this commentary (pp 445, 1176), but in his Sanskrit commentary on that work he not only refers to Mūlārādhanā-darpana but takes over also lengthy passages from it even with some irrelevant sentences[1] A comparative study of both the commentaries, in all the details, is necessary to settle their mutual relation

There are two other small commentaries, Ārādhanā-pañjikā of an unknown author and Bhāvārtha-dīpikā of Manijidaruna (Samvat 1818), the Mss of which, though not fully studied as yet, have come to light According to the Jinaratnakośa, one more Tīkā of Nandīgani is reported, but no Ms of it has come to light so far

iv) Kathākośas Associated with the Bha Ārādhanā

The commentarial activities, so far reviewed are quite worthy of the importance of the contents of the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā which must have been studied and interpreted in different ascetic circles by eminent monks as a part of their daily study and for the benefit of the Ārādhaka The text itself tells us that the attending monks narrate in a sweet and attractive manner various tales to the departing Ārādhaka on the eve of his life, they avoid the Vikathās, but address him with those stories that make him mentally firm and disgusted with worldly life (gāthās Nos 651, 653-55 etc) Major portion of this text is such that it can be conveniently read to the Ārādhaka at the time of his Samādhi-marana, and consequently there are gāthās in this work which contain references to didactic, legendary, edificatory and ascetic tales about which all the details are not given As in the case of Niryuktis and canonical texts like the Uttarādhyayana, we should expect the commentators to give these stories in full drawing their material from earlier literature and oral tradition From the comparative study, set forth below, it is abundantly clear that the stories in the

[1] See Anagāra-dharmāmṛta pp 166, 672-75 and Bha Ārādhanā pp 616-17, etc

Kathākośas of Harisena etc, are meant serially to illustrate the gāthās of the Bha Ārādhanā; and Śrīcandra's Kathākośa quotes the gāthās in many cases, and then gives the stories. These stories contain quite significant verses which show their connection with the Ārādhanā, and being, among themselves, mutually disconnected, one is driven to admit that they might have originally formed a part and parcel of some commentary or the other on the Bha Ārādhanā before they came to be separately compiled by authors like Harisena and Prabhācandra who have not altogether concealed their relation with the Ārādhanā. It was expected that Aparājita and Āśādhara should have included these stories in their commentaries, but to our disappointment they have not done so Between the two, it is only Āśādhara that gives a few remarks, here and there, on these gāthās This neglect on their part indicates that either they were indifferent to this aspect of the contents or by their time the Kathākośas were so usual that they did not like to repeat them in their commentaries It is unfortunate that they simply pass over these references without giving adequate information and referring the reader to the required sources Āśādhara however, has left a crucial remark (p 643) which is extremely significant

अतिदुर्लभत्वे दश दृष्टान्ता सूत्रेऽनुश्रूयन्ते—

चुल्लय पासं धण्णं जूवा रदणाणि सुमिण चक्कं वा। कुम्मं जुग परमाणुं दस दिट्ठंता मणुय-लंभे॥

एते चुल्लीभोजनादिकथासम्प्रदाया दशापि प्राकृतटीकादिषु विस्तरेणोक्ता प्रतिपत्तव्या।

Āśādhara, we have seen, repeatedly refers to a Prākrit commentary, and this remark plainly says that the ten stories, corresponding to Nos 35-44 in the Kathākośa of Harisena, were present in the Prākrit commentary This definitely indicates that the Prākrit commentary etc, included these stories that are later on collected separately by Harisena and others Harisena's text definitely inherits certain linguistic traits in the proper names, grammatical forms, expressions and vocabulary which undoubtedly betray that it is based on some Prākrit original, and that, according to Āsādhara's suggestion, might have been a Prākrit commentary on the Bha Ārādhanā[1] Besides the Kathākosa of Harisena, about which we will discuss later, there are similar collections by Śrīcandra, Nayanandi, Prabhācandra and Nemidatta which we shall have to review before we enumerate their stories in correspondence with the Ārādhanā gāthās

a) Śrīcandra's Kathākośa in Apabhramśa

This work is written in Apabhramśa with varied metres and is divided into 53 Samdhis which do not necessarily correspond to the division of stories some of which are vivisected by the Samdhi-division The colophons give the author's name as Siricamda The Sanskrit Praśasti at the end gives his spiritual genealogy thus Śrīkīrti (of Kundakundānvaya), Śrutakīrti, Sahasrakīrti (who was respected by Gāngeya, Bhojadeva and others) Vīryacandra and Śrīcandra At the request of the Bhavyas, he mastered the work of a ***pūrvācārya***, an earlier author, and wrote this Kathākośa more specifically for the family of Krsna, the son of Sajjana of Prāgvāṭa family who was a resident of Anahillapura in Saurāṣṭra and who was a legal adviser (***dharmasthānasya goṣṭhikah***) of king Mūlarāja As to the

[1] On gāthā No 567 Āśādhara quotes a Prākrit commentary to explain the term ***krmirāga-kambala***, and this explanation, nearly in the same form, is found in the Kathākośa of Harisena (102 82)

date of this author, Prof. Hiralal[1] remarks: 'History tells us that there have been two kings of this name in the Chālukya line of Aṇhilvāḍ. The first was the founder of the dynasty and reigned from A.D. 941 (961?) to 996, and the second, who was tenth in the line, sat on the throne in 1176 A.D. and ruled only for two years. Our author flourished about the time of one of these kings, probably of the first.' But the way in which the Praśasti gives the facts shows that our author was one or two generations later than Mūlarāja.[2] Sahasrakīrti was a contemporary of Gāṅgeya and Bhoja, the former possibly the Kalacūri of Cedi (c. 1015-1040) and the latter the Paramāra of Malwā (c. 1018-1060). So tentatively we can put Śrīcandra at the close of the eleventh century A.D. In the following lines he speaks of the Kathākośa of earlier poets:

महुं धम्मे परेक्कभत्ति गुरुक्क अण्णु किं पि न वियाणमि[3]
जलहि व्व असोसु जो कहकोसु सो हउं केम समाणमि ॥

जो विरइउ आसि महामईहिं
महरिसीहिं अणेयहिं सक्कइहिं ।
तं रयमि केम हउं मंदमई
भूयरहो होइ किं गयणगई ॥

He gives some important facts about the source or the basis of his Kathākośa in the following lines

गणहरहो पयासिउ जिणवइणा सेणियहो आसि जिह गणवइणा ।
सिवकोडिमुणिंदिं जेम जए कहकोसु कहिउ पंचमसमए ।
तिहं गुरुकमेण अहमवि कहमि नियबुद्धिविसेसु नेव रहमि ।
महु देवि सरासइ सम्मुहिया संभवउ समत्थु लोयमहिया ।
आयण्णहो मूलाराहणहें सग्गापवग्गसुहसाहणहें ।
गाहंतरियाउ सुसोहणउ बहु कहउ अत्थि रंजियजणउ ।
धम्मत्थकाममोक्खासयउ गाहासु जासु संठियउ तउ ।
ताणत्थं भणिऊण पुरउ पुणु कहमि कहाउ कयायरउ ।

घत्ता—संबंधविहूणु सव्वु वि जणु रसु न देइ गुणवंतहं ।
तेणिय गाहाउ पयडिवि ताउ कहमि कहाउ सुणंतहं ॥

भणिदं च—

जिह कुड्डेण विहूणं आलेक्खं नत्थि जीवलोयम्मि ।
तिह पयवेणविहूणं पावंति कहं न सोयारा ॥

[1] Allahabad University Journal, vol. I, pp. 171-72

[2] Sajjana was a contemporary of Mūlarāja, his son was Kṛṣṇa, and Śrīcandra refers to the sons etc., of Kṛṣṇa

[3] This Ms. retains initial n, so I have retained it. The lines are quoted with minor corrections.

The thesaurus of tales has come from Jinendra to Gaṇadhara and from Ganadhara to Śrenika, in the Pañcamakāla it was narrated by Śivakoṭimunīndra[1], and through various teachers (*guru-kramena*) it has reached Śrīcandra Secondly, Mūlārādhanā, whose study leads one to the happiness of heaven and liberation, has got in its gāthās so many nice and interesting stories Thirdly, Śrīcandra would first explain the gāthās in which the stories are referred to and then narrate the stories Lastly, Śrīcandra remarks that nothing would be interesting if given out of context, so the stories would follow only after the gāthās are given As there cannot be a painting without the wall, so the readers cannot grasp a story without word-to-word explanation or understanding (of the basic gāthā) He begins with the opening Mangala (of the Bha Ā) which is explained, and then follows the second gāthā which also is explained and on which are added the illustrative stories of Bharata etc in Apabhramśa Thus it is plain that he gives stories associated with the gāthās of Mūlārādhanā of Śivārya or Śivakoti He picks up only those gāthās on which the stories are to be illustrated, explains their literal meaning in Sanskrit, and then gives short and long tales Possibly he complains against his predecessors that they did not give these gāthās, but narrated only the stories, in a way his is a commendable procedure, but unluckily he has not quoted those gāthās upto the end Śrīcandra's Kośa is interspersed with Prākrit and Sanskrit quotations[2]

b) Prabhācandra's Kathākośa in Sanskrit Prose

This work[3] gives in simple Sanskrit prose, with occasional quotations in Sanskrit and Prākrit, the stories of those religious personalities who devoted themselves to fourfold Ārādhanā and attained happiness The text is called Ārādhanā-satkathā-prabandha, the first two gāthās from the Bha Ārādhanā are quoted at the beginning, some of the titles of stories introduce the tales with a few words from the gāthās of Bha Ā , and all these can be traced to that text these facts clearly indicate that this Kośa gives stories to illustrate the direct and indirect references in the Bha Ārādhanā of Śivārya With the second gāthā of it are connected the opening stories about Pātrakesarin, Akalanka, Sanatkumāra, Samantabhadra and Samjayanta The stories on the eight limbs of Samyaktva are identical with those found in the Sk commentary of Prabhācandra on the Ratnakarandaka[4] There is no doubt that all the stories are connected with the Bha Ā , but somehow the text shows two clear divisions After the 90th story of Śakatāla, there are two verses (*yair ārādhya* etc , and *sukomalaih* etc) followed by a prose colophon which records that this Ārādhanā-kathā-prabandha was composed by Prabhācandra Pandita, a resident of Dhārā, in the reign or kingdom of Jayasimhadeva Again the stories (32 in number) are continued, and at the close we have the verse *sukomalaih* etc followed by a concluding remark that here ends the Kathākośa of Bhattāraka Prabhācandra

[1] Reading the whole Kaḍavaka, I do not think that we would be right in taking the second line literally and attributing a Kathākośa to Śivakoṭi

[2] I am very thankful to my friend Prof Hiralalaji who procured for my use the Ms of this Kathākośa belonging to the Balātkāra Jaina Mandira, Karanja (A No 79 Kathākośa Māgadhī) On account of the effect of ink on paper, the written portion of many folios is brittle and even broken

[3] On Prabhācandra, his date and works, see Nyāyakumudacandra, vols I and II, especially their Introductions (Māṇikachandra D Jaina Granthamālā, Nos 38-39, Bombay 1938-41)

[4] Mānikachandra D Jaina Granthamālā, No 24, Bombay Samvat 1982

The supplementary nature of the second part certainly disturbs the order of references found in the gāthās of the Bha Ā There is no sufficient evidence to decide whether both the parts are composed by one and the same Prabhācandra in his early and later parts of life or whether we are to distinguish between Prabhācandra Paṇḍita and Bhaṭṭāraka Prabhācandra To me the former alternative looks more probable The style[1] and presentation of contents are nearly alike in both the parts the only difference that strikes one is that the second section mentions the gāthās more specifically Some of his Sanskrit sentences introducing the stories have a metrical ring, and most of the Prākrit catch words are taken from the gāthās of the Bha Ā The Ms used by me is dated Samvat 1638[2] Further Nemidatta (beginning of the 16th century A D) also follows this very order in his Kathākośa with minor additions and omissions, and he leaves some indication about this division at the close of his story No 82, especially in the verse No 21 So it is quite likely that Prabhācandra himself is responsible for this two-fold division, and my explanation about it is like this We have seen above how these stories were originally incorporated in the commentaries on the Bha Ārādhanā plenty of which were used by Āsādhara It is quite likely that these commentaries, in Prākrit and Sanskrit, differed among themselves on the number, nature etc , of the illustrative stories to be associated with a particular gāthā Prabhācandra might have first completed his Kośa with 90 stories following some commentary, but later when he came across another commentary, or even a Kathākośa, giving more tales, he added a supplementary section, thus incorporating most of the stories associated with Ārādhanā This supplementation has not been carefully done, because some of the stories already given in the first part are repeated in the second part (Nos 14 & 19* 15, 15 & 90* 18, 19 & 90* 22, 22 & 90* 27, 20 & 90* 28, 21 & 90* 31) Simple and short sentences, predominance of the use of past passive participles as predicates and numerous Prākritic words, some of them un-Sanskritic and some back-formations, clearly betray the use of Prākrit sources by Prabhācandra in composing this Kosa As to the date of this work, it might be assigned to the close of the 11th century A D , because Prabhācandra was a contemporary of Jayasimha who succeeded Bhoja of Dhārā (*c* 1018-1060)

c) Nemidatta's Kathākośa in Sanskrit Verses

Nemidatta plainly tells us that his Ārādhanā Kathākośa[3] is based on the work of Prabhācandra who belonged to Mūlasangha, Bhāratī-gaccha, Balātkāragana and Kundakundānvaya, and who wrote the stories in nice sentences As far as possible he followed the same order of stories which he composed in verses, those of Prabhācandra being in prose (Intro verses 5 ff , concluding verses 68 ff) More than once Prabhācandra is respectfully mentioned in this work (2 134, 27 33, 69 35, etc) It appears that Nemidatta claims Prabhācandra to belong to the same Gana etc , as those of his own, though Prabhācandra

[1] The simple style reminds me of the style of Prākrit stories given by Devendra and others, and in all probability Prabhācandra is rendering into Sanskrit the Prākrit sentences That alone will explain why his style is so elaborate in his other works and so simple in this Kathākosa

[2] I am very thankful to Pt Premiji who kindly sent this Ms to me for my use According to my numbering of the stories, there are 90 stories in the first part and 32 in the second part These thirty-two stories are numbered by me as 90*1, 90*2, etc

[3] The Sanskrit text and Hindī translation are published, in three vols , by the Jaina Mitra Kāryālaya, Bombay, Vīra samvat 2440-42 My references are to the chaps and verses of this ed

has not given any details Nemidatta gives his spiritual predecessors thus: Vidyānandi, Mallibhūṣana, Simhanandi and Śrutasāgara, they belong to the line of Bhaṭṭārakas; and he looks upon them as his elders (concluding verses 69-72) Some of them are his contemporaries, and he remembers them in the concluding verses of some of the stories (3 66, 4 83, etc) This work was composed at the desire of his *guru-bhrātā*, Bhaṭṭāraka Mallibhūṣaṇa, in the presence of his disciple Simhanandi and for the religious benefit (*samyaktva-ratna-śriye*) of Śrutasāgarasūri (1 56, 3 66, etc) In view of his relation with these, Nemidatta can be assigned to the beginning of the 16th century A D [1] The work is plainly called Ārādhanā-kathākośa, and in the introductory section the second gāthā of Bha Ā is quoted

Though Nemidatta's Kathākośa is based on that of Prabhācandra, still there are certain apparent differences between the two texts The total number of stories in Prabhācandra's work is 122, while that of Nemidatta is 114 From a casual inspection I find that some seventeen stories (Nos 16, 18, 29, 30, 38, 39, 42, 56, 60, 66, 84, 90*15, 90*16, 90*18, 90*22, 90*27, 90*28) from P 's Kathākośa, though legitimately connected with the Ārādhanā text, are not found in N 's Kathākośa, and nine stories from N 's collection (Nos 25, 28, 53, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112 and 114) have not got their counterparts in P 's work The absence of P 's stories Nos 90*15, 90*18, 90*22, 90*27 and 90*28 can be explained by the fact that they are repetitions with Prabhācandra and are already found once in story Nos 14, 15, 17, 20 and 18 of Nemidatta Of the nine additional tales, No 25, the story of Mrgasenadhīvara, appears to have been already connected with the Ārādhanā text, No 53 is possibly a supplementary discussion suggested from No 52, Nos 28, 108, 109-12 and 114 are illustrative stories connected with the Ratnakarandaka III 18, III 18*2[2], IV 28, IV 30 respectively, and Nemidatta's stories closely agree with those given by Prabhācandra in his commentary on these verses of the Ratnakarandaka

d) Nayanandi's Ārādhanā and Other Ārādhanā Kathākośas

Details about Nayanandi's work are not completely available This Apabhramśa text is said to have contained two parts with 56 and 58 Samdhis, but the Pattan Ms inspected by Dalal contained only 30 and 27 Samdhis[3] It is not explicit from the title, Ārādhanā, whether it is a narrative work or a dogmatical treatise The bulk of the work, its description as a Kāvya (like Śrīcandra calling his Apabhramśa Kathākośa a kāvya in his Sanskrit Praśasti) and its definite association with Ārādhanā tempt me to suggest that Nayanandi's work might turn out to be a Kathākośa like that of Śrīcandra

The Jinaratnakośa mentions the following Ārādhanā Kathākośas in addition, their Mss should be brought to light and studied in details 1) Ā K in Sanskrit by Simhanandin, 2) Ā K in Prākrit by Chatrasena, 3) Ā K in Sanskrit by Brahmadeva Brahmacārin this Ms is reported from Śravana Belgol, and it should be seen whether it is identical with Nemidatta's work or an independent composition, 4) Ā K of Ratnakīrti it is reported from Delhi, in all probability it might turn out to be a separate compilation of Ārādhanā stories given by Ratnakīrti in his Sanskrit commentary on the Ārādhanāsāra[4], gāthās 49-51, and lastly 5) Ā K of an unknown author

[1] Peterson Reports IV, p cxxiii, Premi Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, pp 406-12, etc

[2] See Jugalkishore's Intro to the Ratnakaraṇḍaka (Bombay Samvat 1982), p. 43, verse No. 72

[3] See the Intro to Bhavisayattakahā in the G O S, p 43

[4] This is already referred to above

e) THE VAḌḌĀRĀDHANE IN OLD-KANNAḌA PROSE

As early as 1883, it was K B Pathak and through him J F Fleet that published a few lines from what they called Upasarga-kevaligala kathe of Revākotyācārya to explain some words like *pañca-mahāśabda* and *niśidhi*[1] As far as I know, they have not given any information about the Ms used by them On getting, however, an indirect clue from another note of Fleet,[2] lately I made a careful search for this Ms in the Jaina Matha of Śrī Lakṣmīsena Bhaṭṭāraka, Kolhapur, and I found a palm-leaf Ms [3] whose wooden board bears almost the above name (Palm-leaf Mss , No 45) The longer extract given by Pathak is found on pp 113a-114 of this Ms The designation of the Ms inscribed in Old-Kannada characters on the board, namely, Upasarga-kevali-kathe, appears to be just a convenient and conjectural label written possibly by the library manager perhaps after reading a few opening lines No such name is found in the Ms itself The opening words are Sukumāra-svāmi and some of the concluding words run thus

यी पेळ्द् पत्तोंभत्तु कथेय रेवाकोट्याचार्यर्प्पेळ्द् वड्डाराधनेय कवचमेंबधिकारऊ।

In addition to what has been already written, this is enough to indicate that this work is identical with the Vaddārādhane, major portion of which is edited by my friend Prof D L Narasimhachar, Mysore, and about the age of which some scholars have quite eloquently expressed their views[4]

[1] Indian Antiquary XII, pp 95 f, 99 f

[2] Indian Antiquary XII, p 216

[3] The Kolhapur Ms, which would be called L hereafter, can be described thus It is a palm-leaf Ms containing 147 leaves written on both sides, the last page being blank The bulk of the Ms, without the boards, is about 11 75×1 5×2 inches On each page, due to string holes and surrounding space, the written portion is divided into three columns There are eight lines on a page with 55 to 60 letters in each line It is written in Old-Kannaḍa characters, the old forms of *r* and *ḷ* are used, and there are other peculiarities of that script such as the absence of the distinction between long and short vowels and between some aspirated and un-aspirated consonants The Ms opens thus सुकुमारस्वामि ॥ नम सिद्धेभ्य ॥ इंदसयवंदियाणं etc ॥ एस सुरासुर etc ॥ तिलोयसव्वजीवाणं हियं धम्मोवदेसिणं। वड्ढमाणं महावीरं वंदित्ता सव्ववेद्दणं ॥ नमः श्रीवर्धमानाय etc ॥ येंदितु श्रीवर्द्धमानभट्टारकर्गे etc At the close of the last story, there are three Prākrit verses full of corrupt readings जदि ता एवं etc ॥ किं पुण etc ॥ जिणवयण etc Then we have in Kannaḍa prose यो पेळ्द पत्तोंभत्तु कथेय रेवाकोट्याचार्यर्प्पेळ्द् वड्डाराधनेय कवचमेंबधिकारऊ ॥ श्रीपंचगुरुवे शरणु। प्लव सवत्सरद कार्तिक शुद्ध १ शुक्रवार बेलूर चंद्रय्यवैश्यर चंद्रय्यनु वड्डाराधनेय पुस्तकवनु बरदनु मंगळमहाश्री ॥ ४ ॥ But for a few leaves that are broken across and stitched lately, the Ms is quite intact Is is copied at Belur, in the Mysore state The year is not given From the general appearance, the Ms looks quite old, say at least three hundred years From what little I could compare I find that this Ms belongs to the group of *gha*, *ca*, *cha* described by Mr D L Narasimhachar

[4] As far as I know, about Vaḍḍārādhane here are the sources, textual and critical Pathak and Fleet Indian Antiquary XII, pp 95, 99 etc, R Narasimhachary Kavicarite I, p 282 D L Narasimhachar Karṇāṭaka Sāhitya Pariṣatpatrike, XVI, pp 173-231 (Intro and the stories of Sukumāra, Bhadrabāhu and Vidyuccora, references to these are given by me with starred numbers of pages), Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣatpatrike XXIV, No 4, pp i-iii and 1-26 (story 1), Ibidem XXV No 2-3, pp i-v and i-viii, 27-44 (story 2), Ibid XXV, No 4, pp 45-66 (stories 3-5), Ibid XXVI, No 1, pp 67-88 (story 6), Ibid XXVI, No 2, pp 89-108 (stories 7-10), Ibid XXVII, No 1, pp 109-128 (Stories 11-13 and a page of 14) M G Pai Mūru Upanyāsagaḷu (Dharwar 1940), pp 111-122, Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣatpatrike XXVI, No 2, pp 134-36 S Śrikaṇṭha Śāstri Sources of Karṇāṭaka History, vol I, (Mysore 1940), p xx

Vaddārādhane may be accepted as the name of this collection of stories beginning with that of Sukumāra and ending with that of Vrsabhasena We have seen how the Bha Ā contains legendary references which are illustrated by stories that might have been primarily included in its Prākrit and Sanskrit commentaries but later on came to be preserved in separate Kośas some of which are already noted above This Kannada work is a partial Kathākośa giving nineteen stories which are referred to in the Bha Ā of Śivārya or Śivakoti, gāthās Nos 1539-1557 Apart from minor differences in readings, these Prākrit gāthās are given at the beginning of respective stories and also literally explained in Kannada The Ms L gives three more gāthās (*jadi tā evam* etc) corresponding to Nos 1558-60 of the Bha Ā , in continuation of the opening gāthās, at the end of the work The stories are presented in elaborate Kannada prose interspersed with quotations in Prākrit (including Apabhramśa), Sanskrit and Kannada The style is less Sanskrit-ridden than that of Cāmundarāya-purāna but more dignified than that of later Nompikathes plenty of which are available in old Mss Excepting in the contexts of dogmatical discourses and traditional enumerations, the text presents a vigorous prose maintaining a balanced proportion of Sanskrit and Kannada words It does not imitate the classical style of prose of some of the Kannada Campūs which is mostly Sanskrit in its vocabulary, but it has evolved a fine blend of racy expression that shows no special aptitude for Sanskrit words, if they could be conveniently substituted by genuine and Tadbhava Kannada words One feels that the sentences have become involved due to too many gerundives, and some struggle for clear expression of ideas is seen here and there Economy of expression has not weighed with the author, but as in the case of the prose of the Ardhamāgadhī canon, descriptive and enumerative repetitions[1] are scattered all over the work Different aspects of the style of this text deserve to be studied in more details On account of similar expressions, common ideas and identical quotations found in different stories, there seems to be no doubt about the fact that all the nineteen stories are written by one and the same author, whoever he might be

With a slight change in the order, at one place[2], these nineteen stories correspond to Nos 126-144 in the Kathākośa of Harisena with which they have closer affinity than with any other Kośas reviewed above A comparative reading of these stories, side by side, discloses many interesting points[3] There are groups of verses, here and there, in Harisena's Kosa (126 19 f , 162 f , 220 f , 256 f , 127 145 f , 259 f , 89 f , 131 67 f , etc) which have close agreement with the Vaddārādhane in those contexts But when we go into more details, perhaps with the exception of Vrsabhasena's story (K[4] 135 and V 10) which shows nearly the same extent of contents in both, all the stories in the Vaddārādhane are longer and contain more details than those given by Harisena The story of Sukosala, as given by the Kannada text, begins with verse No 107 of Harisena's story and gives the contents of the first 106 verses later. this is only a glaring illustration which indicates

[1] See *grāmekarātram* etc , p 46 foot-note 8, p 66 line 16, names of diseases *vāta-pitta* etc , p 63, 92, types of villages etc , *grāma-nagara* etc pp 46, 66, 77, 82, 96, 103, 107 etc

[2] According to the sequence of the gāthās of Bha Ā , the story of Enikāputra should be the 5th and that of Bhadrabāhu the 6th, this order is followed by the printed text, but the editor in enumerating the 19 stories has interchanged their places

[3] My observations have in view mainly the first ten Kannada stories which are so far available in print The next three stories reached my hands rather late

[4] K =Kathākośa of Harisena and V =Vaddārādhane

that the order of the presentation of details is not necessarily the same in both the works Besides giving additional sub-stories, details about more Bhavas, stylistic descriptions and traditional enumerations, one feels, as in the case of Sanatkumāra's story, that perhaps Vaddārādhane is following, at times, a different recension too for some of its details[1] So far as these nineteen stories are concerned, it is plain that Harisena narrates the main events of the story in a straight way without adding too many extraneous details[2] It may be that Harisena is nearing the close of his big work, while the Kannada author is vigorously shaping and narrating his stories which probably constitute all that he wrote in this context On the whole the proper names etc , in different stories are the same in both the works, but there are a few significant differences which deserve special attention; Śailapura, Jayakā and Vodaka in K 126 124 f , but Śvetapura, Jaise and Bodhana in V i, p 17, Gandharva-bhūpāla in K 127 152, but Sundara (v 1 Gandara etc) Pāndya in V ii, p 31, line 5, Surendradatta in K 126 210, but Sūradatta in V i, p 20, Gomini in K. 126 206, but Gaurī in V ii, p 33, etc Additional and varying details, absence of close agreement in the order of events to be narrated and the differences in some of the proper names rule out the possibility that one is directly and mechanically following the other in writing out these stories A sober evaluation of these aspects along with the common points lead us to the conclusion that both of them are based on the same source, possibly a Prākrit commentary on the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā, after admitting, however, the probability that every author elaborated the stories in his own way but kept the outline and the motive intact

The facts that the collection of Kannada stories is called Vaddārādhane and that it interprets the gāthās of the Bha Ā , just as Śrīcandra has done, on which the stories are narrated only confirm the view that it might have been based on a commentary If the Kannada author followed the Sanskrit Kathākośa of Harisena or of some one else, he would not ordinarily give the gāthās and show crucial differences in the proper names Not only Harisena's text, as shown below, but also the Kannada stories betray some traces of the Prākrit source

Though the problem is not fully studied yet, it has to be accepted that it is the Prākrit tendencies that gave a lead to the growth of Kannada vocabulary, and a set-back was given to the excessive use of pure Sanskrit words for which Tadbhava words, which were derived according to Prākrit tendencies subjected, of course, to the genius of Kannada phonology, came to be substituted Even after admitting this and making some concession for this sort of Prākrit influence, we come across certain traits indicating that these Kannada stories are based on a Prākrit source In the story of Bhadrabāhu, the boundaries of Madhyadeśa are stated in a Prākrit verse (p 80) which is possibly a relic from the Prākrit original There are many expressions which look like Prākrit remnants *āyambila* (p 61, see the foot-note 2), *chatthatthama-dasam-duvālasa* (p 40), *jāvajjīvam* (pp 76, 82, 108), *paccakkhāna* (76), *padikamana* (p 24, 86 etc), *boḷaha bolaha* (p 79, Imp 2nd p pl from *vola* to go, to get a way[3]), *vakkhānisi* (pp 3, 5) There are other words like *Lacchi* (p 91), *savana* (p 6), *risi* (p 9) etc ,

[1] The Kannaḍa version reminds me, in some portions at least, the story given by Devendra in his commentary on the Uttarādhyayana, see Prākrit-kathāsamgraha (Ahmedabad Samvat 1976), pp 17-28 Also compare the story No 3 in Prabhācandra's Kośa

[2] Hariṣeṇa would simply refer to the event of marriage, but the Kannaḍa text would describe a Svayamvara

[3] In the corresponding passage (131, 30) Hariṣeṇa uses *gaccha*

which are not altogether impossible in any Kannada work not based on a Prākrit original Harisena too might have worked with a Prākrit original before him; it is interesting to note certain names which are differently Sanskritised by the Kathākośa and by the Vaddārādhane, and in some cases at least we can definitely lay our finger, keeping in mind the possible orthographical confusions and phonetic changes, on the probable Prākrit name in the original Dayāvāda and Dayāvata (K 126 26, V pp 5, 6), Śailapura and Śvetapura (K 126 124, V p 17), Samvala and Śambara (K 126 57, V p 10), Sodālikā and Modāḷi (K 126 130, V p 17), Ravibindu and Ratibindu (K 127 242, V p 36), Jayamatī and Jayāvati (K 127 263, V p 38), Vapravāda and Vaprapāḷa (K 131 69, V p 87), Amśumān and Sumanta, v 1, Sumana (K 134 2, V p 100), Jinapālita and Jinavādika (K 135 7, V p 104), Vinyātata and Venātata (K 138 40, V p *226) etc Casually peeping through the Ms L, I came across names like Vajradāda (p 117) and Bhattimitra (p 137) The doublets, noted above, are impossible, if these two texts had a common Sanskrit origin or they followed each other This evidence is extremely interesting it definitely indicates a Prākrit source for these stories, and possibly a common one

The title Vaddārādhane for these Kannada stories has come to stay, it has been made sufficiently popular by their editor as well as by subsequent writers, and without any hesitation the writers of the Moodabidri and Kolhapur Mss use this title for their copies To be more accurate, there is no evidence to say what name the author of the Kannada work gave to his collection of these nineteen stories in my opinion, this name has not come down to us This point will be clear from the colophon of the Kannada text, as distinguished from the colophons of the Mss , which might be presented thus·

ई पेळ्द पत्तोंबत्तु कथेगळ् [।] शिवकोट्याचार्यर् पेळ्द वोड्डाराधनेय कवचवु मंगळं महा श्री ।

This is the reading of the Moodabidri Ms with which the Kolhapur Ms has some differences, the important one being Vaddārādhaneya The meaning, however, is practically the same The free rendering would be 'Here or thus are narrated nineteen tales Thus ends (auspiciously expressed by the words *mamgalam mahā śrī*) the (section) Kavaca belonging to Vaddārādhanā of Śivakotyācārya' Kavaca, in Indian literature, usually indicates a class of texts containing hymns or Mantras, associated with some deity or the other, whose regular recitations, on account of their miraculous power, are said to protect a devotee from all the dangers, just as a coat of armour can protect a soldier This type is not quite popular with the Jaina authors, if at all composed, it can be associated legitimately only with Śāsanadevatās such as Jvālāmālinī, Padmāvatī etc , and we have one Ms , No 575 of 1895-98, at the Bhandarkar O R Institute, which contains Śri-Padmāvatī-kavaca comprising a few propitiatory verses soliciting protection The Kavaca-section associated with Ārādhanā texts is altogether different It consists in an exhortation, accompanied by illustrations of tales of religious martyrs, addressed to an Ārādhaka on the eve of his life, so that it might give him sufficient courage to face the different Parīsahas Like an armour, it serves the purpose of spiritual protection The Bhāsya on the Jītakalpa-sūtram[1] contains a Kavaca-dvāra (gāthās 476-90), and there are available independent Mss of Kavaca-dvāra[2] (No 579 of 1895-98 in the B O R I , Poona) often included under Prakīrnaka texts of the Jaina canon The Kavaca attributed to Śivakotyācārya, in the above

[1] Edited by Punyavijaya, Ahmedabad Samvat 1994

[2] Descriptive Catalogue, vol XVII, part 1 (Poona 1935), pp 330, 380

colophon, is definitely a section (gāthā Nos 1509-1682) of that name from his Bhagavatī Ā , and it contains religious instructions as a protection or armour against the Parīsahas etc The Prākrit gāthās quoted at the opening of the stories are drawn from this section, and they represent a solid bulk of illustrative gāthās Śrīcandra adds a sentence *kavacāhiyāro'-yam* immediately after the story of Vṛṣabhasena that explains, to a certain extent, why the Kavaca-section ends with these nineteen stories This further shows that Vaddārādhane, or Vaddārādhanā (in Prākrit), is only another name of the Bhaga Ā of Śivakoti The etymological interpretation of this additional name has been already subjected to a good deal of speculation The two roots *vrdh* and *brh* look like doublets showing dialectal variations, and undoubtedly they lie at the basis of the Prākrit word *vadda*, big or great Its etymological derivation is attended with some difficulty, so Prākritists have included it in the list of Deśī words At any rate *vaddārādhanā* means a big Ārādhanā, and as shown above, Bha Ā , is a pretty big work among the Ārādhanā texts so far known So it looks quite reasonable that the Bha Ā , in order to be distinguished from later and smaller Ārādhanā texts, came to be called by the names Mūlārādhanā and Vaddārādhanā The colophon that concludes Kavaca, therefore, refers to Bhaga Ā , and its author Śivakoṭi, and it has nothing to say either about the title of the Kannada stories or about their author

Pathak gave currency to the name Revākotyācārya following the reading of the Ms L It is an improbable name so far as Jaina authors are concerned, there is every possibility that the Old-Kannada *śi* from the exemplar has been wrongly copied as *re* in the Ms L, and now other Mss , which read Śivakotyācārya, have come to light In the light of the explanation given by me above, it is plain that the colophon mentions Śivakoti as the author of Vaddārādhanā whose verses form the basis of the Kannada stories We may call the Kannada work by the name Vaddārādhanā following the Mss of Mudabidri and Kolhapur, but we have no evidence to attribute the authorship of Kannada stories to Śivakoti To conclude, we can call these stories by the name Vaddārādhane, but we do not know who the author was

I have already discussed the probable age of Śivakoti and his Bha Ā A tentative attempt may be made here to settle the date of this Kannada text on which some views are already expressed 1) Pathak causally implied that this work is contemporary with Torgallu inscription of A D 1188, and R Narasimhachary, who had no occasion to examine the complete Ms , quietly followed Pathak and assigned this work to *c* 1180 A D 2) Mr D L Narasimhachary detects, in this text, certain old terminations like *-om*, *-ol* and *-or* etc , found in the inscriptions upto the 8th century A D and earlier forms like *irdon*, *pordidon*, also the use of *amma* for *appa* found in the Kannada works upto the 10th century A D The text shows close similarities with the style of Cāmundarāya-purāṇa (A D 978) Bhadrabāhu's story agrees with that given by Harisena in his Kathākosa (A D 931) which might be the source of this Kannada version In the light of these considerations, he would assign the date *c* 940 A D for this work 3) Mr M Govind Pai advances the following arguments to settle the date of this work In the text of the Vaddāradhane some verses from Bhartrhari's Śatakas are found, but their text and date are not definite The text mentions Dināra, so it must be later than 2nd century A D It calls Belgola by the name Kaḷbappu which is first mentioned in a Śravana Beḷgoḷa inscription of 650 A D , so it must be earlier than 650. Then to confirm this, he collects good many words and forms that are found in early Kannada works and inscriptions, and thus the Kannada Vaddārādhane is

to be put not later than 6th century A D Some of his remarks are baseless and imaginary[1]; one feels as if he is bent on assigning high antiquity to this work after forcing every argument for his purpose, and his facts and premisses do not logically lead to the conclusion arrived at by him Chronology is not a matter of taste and forced opinion we should dispassionately record the evidence and see what limits can be put to the age of this work 4) Prof S Śrīkanth Śāstri has not argued out his conclusion, but he remarks that the Vaddārādhane of Śivakoti probably belongs to the 7th century A D

My own study of the text, especially of the printed portion, has revealed certain facts which I shall note down and try to put broad limits to the age of this important Kannada work Scrutinising the internal evidence, we find here a good number of quotations in Prākrit (with Apabhraṃśa), Sanskrit and Kannada It is quite likely that some of the Prākrit and Sanskrit quotations are inherited from the Prākrit original and some others, along with the Kannada verses, might have been added by the Kannada author That explains, to a certain extent, why we get a group of verses expressing nearly the same ideas (pp 8, 9, 96, 97 etc) If we could trace the sources of these quotations, unanimously included in the text by all the known Mss , it would not be difficult to put an earlier limit to the age of this book I have been able to trace a few quotations to their sources which can be arranged thus according to tentative chronology The opening gāthās of the nineteen stories, the three concluding gāthās from the Ms L and a quotation (*jaha jaha* etc , in the story of Gurudatta, p 120 of L) are all found, with slight dialectal variations, in the Bha Ā of Śivakoti Of the three opening Prākrit verses in the Ms L, possibly quoted as a Mangala by the Kannada author, the first is from the Pañcāstikāya (No 1) and the second from the Pravacanasāra (No 1) of Kundakunda Then *khammāmi* etc , (p 43) is found in the Mūlācāra (II 7) and also in the Pratikramana (p 9, Bhavanagar ed Samvat 1954) from which (Ibid , p 10) appears to be quoted, with a slight variation, another verse *hā duṭṭhu* etc (p 99) The verse *yadyapi* etc (p 107) is quoted from the Praśamarati-prakarana (No 107) of Umāsvāti The opening Sanskrit verse *namah śrī* etc , is the Mangala of Ratnakarandaka of Samantabhadra who is assigned to *c* 2nd century A D Some quotations like *yesām na vidyā* etc , (p 97), *yāvat svastham idam* etc (p *229) and *traṣṇām chindhi* (p 121 of Ms L) are traced to the Śatakas (Nīti 13, Vairāgya 88 and Nīti 77)[2] of Bhartrhari whose date and the authenticity of a particular verse in the Śataka are uncertain The Apabhraṃśa quotation *chijjau* etc (p 43, not found in some Mss) is from the Paramātma-prakāśa (i 72) of Joindu[3] who probably flourished in the 6th century A D The verse *kasya mātā* etc , found in the story of Gurudatta (p 119a of Ms L) is from the Varāngacarita[4] (XV 78) of Jatā-Simhanandi, *c* close of the 7th century A D Then *ādau janma* etc (p 63) appears to be quoted from that portion of the Mahāpurāna which is composed by Gunabhadra (Ādi , 46 196, p 3121, Kolhapur ed) who completed it some time before Śaka 820 (+78=898 A D) when Lokasena glorified

[1] Some of the statements and premisses of Mr Pai are incorrect and contradictory to the known facts He says that there is no practice of composing or quoting Prākrit gāthās in a Sanskrit work, that Sanskrit verses cannot be quoted in Prākrit works, that Prākrit is not *praudhasāhitya*—these are all imaginary statements which do not deserve to be refuted even

[2] These numbers are from Telang's edition, Bombay 1874

[3] See the Intro to my edition (Bombay 1937) of that work, p 67

[4] Edited by me in the Māṇikacandra D J Granthamālā, Bombay 1938, Intro p 22, also Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrike XXV, No 3, pp 133-46

this work[1] As long as it has not been shown, with fresh evidence, that these quotations are traced to still earlier works and that their genuineness in the Kannaḍa text is doubtful, we will have to admit that the Kannada Vaḍḍārādhane cannot be dated earlier than Śaka 820 or 898 A D

Among the other quotations, *so dhammo* etc, (p 9) is included by Padmaprabha[2] (*c* last quarter of the 12th and the first quarter of the 13th century A D) in his commentary on the Niyamasāra (I 6, p 6) with the phrase *tathā c'oktam*, and *kāle samprati* etc (p 81) is found, with slight variations, in the Subhāsitāvali (p 5, Belgaum ed 1897) of Sakalakīrti, *c* 1464 A D, but this work is more or less an anthology So these have not got any value to settle the date of our work

Harisena's Kathākośa mentions a king Gandharva-bhūpāla (127 152), but the Kannada text reads, in the corresponding context, Sundara-Pāndya with the alternative readings Gandara- Gāndāra- and Gandāra- (p 31) The title Sundara is often repeated with the names of Pāndyan kings[3] and the reading too is uncertain so this reference cannot be safely used for chronological purpose

Thus it is definite that the Vaddārādhane is later than 898 A D and earlier than 1403 A D which is the date of the earliest known Ms

Let us see whether the above limits can be brought nearer by studying the style and grammatical forms of this text The prose style appears to me later than that of Cāvundarāya-purāna but earlier than that of prose Nompikathes in view of the comparatively meagre use of Sanskrit words and of its racy Kannada expression So I would put this work later than Cāvundarāya-purāna (978 A D) On the basis of old forms etc, a high antiquity is claimed for this work In evaluating these grammatical forms, we have to bear in mind, and to a certain extent it is borne out by the various readings, that the copyists might have subjected the text to contemporary idiom and usage here and there so our conclusions from these are bound to be tentative This text, one feels, does present much older grammatical material, but this, by itself, might not prove necessarily the antiquity of the text but as well indicate the proficiency of the author in earlier phases of Kannada It is not enough, therefore, if we simply detect old forms etc, as Mr Pai has done, but we should be able to state the latest age-limit upto which they were current and after which they came to be gradually replaced, and this may help us to put some tentative later limit and not the earlier limit My remarks are based on a casual survey, and I hope that some Kannada scholar would undertake a thorough and statistical study In this text initial *p* is usually retained *podapem* (p 3), *peldam* (p 11), *puttidom*, *puṭṭidaḷ* (p 33), also *vodan* (p 28) The inscriptions show that it is only after the 11th century that *p* was being gradually replaced by *h*[4] Secondly, we come across unassimilated conjunct groups like *irddu* (p 48), *irppor* (p 55), *karccittu* (p 31), etc By the close of the 13th century this assimilation was an accomplished fact, though the tendency was manifest in the popular speech by the middle of the 12th century[5] Lastly, we get verbal forms like

[1] Premi Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, p 513 f

[2] Journal of the University of Bombay, September 1942

[3] Smith Early History of India, 3rd ed, Oxford 1914, p 456, Banerji Prehistoric, Ancient and Hindu India, Calcutta 1939, p 283

[4] A N Narasimhia A Grammar of the Oldest Kanarese Inscriptions, Mysore 1941, p 2

[5] Ibidem, p. 92

pordidom (p 1), *kalvom* (p 12), *kūdidom* (p 27), *sattol* (p 34) also *sattaḷ* (p 34), etc. these are undoubtedly old forms[1], but they become rare after the 11th century[2] These linguistic traits indicate that the Kannada Vaddārādhane can be assigned, within the broad but definite limits of 898 to 1403 A D , probably to the 11th century A D

5 BHA ĀRĀDHANĀ AND THE DEPENDANT KATHĀNAKAS

After acquainting ourselves with various Kathākośas associated with the Bha Ā , it is necessary to note the gāthās which have served as the basis for different Kathās and to record the corresponding stories from the Kośas In a few cases Śrīcandra has actually given the gāthās at the beginning of his stories, and Prabhācandra also notes a few words from them here and there The numbers of gāthās, which are not referred to either by Śrīcandra or Prabhācandra, but noted by me, are put in square brackets With minor changes made in the light of the variants given by the commentaries, the gāthās are reproduced from the Sholapur edition which is followed also in numbering the gāthās Those gāthās that are not specifically commented upon by Śrīvijaya are marked with an asterisk at the end, and those that are not found in the Sholapur ed are put in square brackets and bear no serial numbers When one gāthā corresponds to more than one story, I have put Devanāgarī numerals on the words of the gāthā Now and then significant remarks from the Vijayodayā and the Mū -darpana are reproduced In the case of Harisena's Kośa (HK) and Nemidatta's Kośa (NK), the numbers are from the printed texts, Śrīcandra's Kośa (ŚK) is referred to by page numbers of the Karanja Ms , and the numbers of Prabhācandra's stories are continuous upto 90, and the following tales from the second part of the book are numbered 90*1, etc In the last column the references from the Païnnas (Bh =Bhattaparinnā, M =Maranasamāhi, S =Samthāraga) and the Kannada Vaddārādhane (=V) are noted Those from the Païnnas, it is hoped, will easily show the common capital of primary legends independently inherited by the Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras When the gāthās from the Païnnas show an almost literal agreement I have added a sign of equation with them This record of corresponding stories does not mean that the stories are in every way identical in all these sources, but it implies that these particular references should be studied by those who want to go into more details about an individual story from different works In some cases the names too differ, but still the frame-work of the story and the motive are alike, in some cases the sources differ in their details, extent and sub-stories dealing with different births, and in a few cases the agreement is only partial and even remote When the reference is not of an explicit character, difference of opinion is possible in spotting a particular gāthā from the Bha Ā and associating the stories with it, and that is why the numbers of gāthās proposed by me are put in square brackets In spotting them I have scrutinised all the available evidence, both direct and indirect, in the form of serial character of the numbers of gāthās, common ideas, parallel expressions, significant terms and the suggestions from the commentaries The task of marking out the stories from the continuous narration of Śrīcandra's text from a closely written Ms

[1] Ibidem, pp 168, 206

[2] My friend Prof K G Kundangar informs me that the Accusative termination *-ān*, the Loc termi *-uḷ*, and the 3rd p sing and pl terminations *-ān*, *-āḷ*, and *-ār*, which occur in the inscriptions of the 5th century etc , are not to be noticed in the Vaḍḍārādhane (see the Halmidi inscription, Sources of Karnāṭaka History, p 20)

was a difficult one, but I have tried to do it as carefully as possible. The textual variants in the gāthās quoted by Śrīcandra are interesting from the dialectal point of view and deserve to be noted when a critical text of the Bha. Ā is attempted

Nos	Bhagavatī Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK[1]	PK	NK	Others
19 22 [23]	आराहणाए कज्जे परियम्मं सव्वदा वि कायव्वं। परियम्मभाविदस्स हु सुहसज्झाराहणा होदि॥ जोगाभाविदकरणो सत्तू जेदूण जुद्धरंगम्मि। जह सो कुमारमल्लो रज्जपडायं बला हरदि॥ तह भाविदसामण्णो मिच्छत्तादी रिवू विजेदूण। आराहणापडायं हरदि सुसथाररंगम्मि॥	1[2]	3			
24	पुव्वमभाविदजोग्गो आराधेज्ज मरणं जदि वि कोई। खण्णुगदिट्ठंतो सो तं खु पमाणं ण सव्वत्थ॥	2-3[3]	4			
44	सम्मत्तादीचारा संका कंखा तहेव विदिगिंछा। परदिट्ठीण पसंसा अणायदणसेवणा चेव॥	4-6 7	4-6	6 9	6 9	
45	उवगूहणठिदिकरणं वच्छल्लपभावणा गुणा भणिदा। सम्मत्तविसोधीए उवगूहणकारया चउरो॥	8-10 10-12	8-12 12-17	11-13	11-13	
48*1	सद्दहया पत्तियया रोचयफासतया पवयणस्स। सयलस्स जेण एदे सम्मत्ताराहया होंति॥*	13	17	90*1	83	
87	अववादियलिंगकदो विसयासत्तिं अगूहमाणो य। णिंदणगरहणजुत्तो सुज्झदि उवधिं परिहरंतो॥	14-5	17-19	90*1-3	84-5	
92	आणक्खिदा य लोचेण अप्पणो होदि धम्मसद्धा य। उग्गो तवो य लोचो तहेव दुक्खस्स सहणं च॥	16	19	90*4	86	
113	काले[1] विणए[2] उवहाणे[3] बहुमाणे[4] तह अणिण्हवणे[5]। वंजण[6] अत्थ[7] तदुभये[8] विणओ णाणम्मि अट्ठविहो॥	17-26	20-25	90*5-14	87-96	
201	भयणीए विधम्मिज्जंतीए एयत्तभावणाए जहा। जिणकप्पिओ ण मूढो खवओ वि ण मुज्झइ तधेव॥ वि—जिनकल्पिको नागदत्तो नाम मुनिर्भगिन्याम- योग्यं कारयन्त्यामपि एकत्वभावनया मोहं न गतः। मू—जिनकल्पमाचरणविशेषं प्रतिपन्नो नागदत्तो नाम मुनिः।	27	26	14 also 90*15	14	
262	तं वत्थुं मोत्तव्वं जं पडि उप्पज्जदे कसायग्गी। तं वत्थुमल्लिएज्जो जत्थोवसमो कसायाणं॥	28	27	90*16		

[1] The numbered and the next unnumbered pages are referred to by the same number.

[2] See verses Nos 22-3 from that story

[3] Compare especially verse No 17 of that story

Nos	Bhagavati Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK	PK.	NK	Others
328	गुणपरिणामादीहिं य विज्जावच्चुज्जदो समजेदि । तित्थयरणामकम्मं तिलोयसंखोभयं पुण्णं ॥	29	28	90*17	97	
345	सुजणो वि होइ लहुओ दुज्जणसमेलणाए दोसेण । माला वि मोल्लगरुआ होइ लहू मडयससिट्ठा ॥	30	29			
346	दुज्जणससग्गीए संकिज्जदि संजदो वि दोसेण । पाणागारे दुद्धं पियंतओ बंभणो चेव । मू—बंभणो शिवभूतिर्नाम ।	31	29	15 also 90*18	15	
348	अदिसजदो वि दुज्जणकएण दोसेण पाउणइ दोस । जह घूगकए दोसे हंसो य हओ अपावो वि ।	32	30	16		
356	आसयवसेण एवं पुरिसा दोसं गुणं व पावंति । तम्हा पसत्थगुणमेव आसयं अल्लिएज्जाह ।	33	30	90*19	98	
373	अप्पो वि परस्स गुणो सप्पुरिसं पप्प बहुदरो होदि । उदए व तेल्लबिंदू किह सो जंपिहिदि परदोसं ॥	34	35	90*20	99	
430*1	[चुल्लय[1]पास[2]धण्णंजूवा[4]रदणाणि[5]सुमिण[6] चक्क[7]वा । कुम्मं[8] जुग[9] परमाणुं[10] दस दिट्ठंता मणुयलंभे ॥* मू—एते चुल्लीभाजनादिकथासम्प्रदाया दशापि प्राकृतटीका- दिषु विस्तरेणोक्ताः प्रतिपत्तव्या. ।]	35-44	36 f	90*21	100	
547	जह बालो जंपंतो कज्जमकज्जं व उज्जुगं भणदि । तह आलोचेदव्वं मायामोस च मोत्तूणं ॥	45	38	17	16	
589	मिगतण्हादो उदगं इच्छइ चंदपरिवेसणे कूरं । जो सो इच्छइ सोधी अकहंतो अप्पणो दोसे ॥ मू—अत्र कथयार्थप्रतिपत्तिर्यथा-चन्द्रनामा सूपकार· परिवारहितो राज्ञा नि सारितोऽन्य कृत । परिवारेण च राज्ञा सह भोजनं परिहृतम् । एवमेकदा समायाते तस्मिन् राजनि भोक्तुमुपविष्टे गगने चन्द्रस्य परिवेष- मालोक्योक्तं लोकैरद्य चन्द्रस्य परिवेषो जात इति । एतच्छ्रुत्वा परिवारः सूपकारस्य राजकुले प्रवेशो जात इति मत्वा भोक्तुं गतवान्न च कूरं प्राप्तवान् इति ।			18		
732	अच्छीणि संघसिरिणो मिच्छत्तणिकाचणेण पडिदाणि । कालगदो वि य संतो जादो सो दीहससारे ॥	46	39	19 also 90*22	17	

Nos	Bhagavati Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK	PK	NK	Others
737	भावाणुराग[1] पेमाणुराग[2] मज्जाणुराग[3] रत्तो वा। धम्माणुराग[4] रत्तो य होहि जिणसासणे णिच्चं ॥*	47-50	42-3	90*23-6	101-4	Bh 64
	[एक्का वि जिणे भत्ती णिद्दिट्ठा दुक्खलक्खणासयरी। सोक्खाणमणंताणं होदि हु सा कारणं परमं ॥*]	51	43	22 also 90*27	20	
739	दंसणभट्ठो भट्ठो[1] ण हु भट्ठो होदि चरणभट्ठो[2] हु। दंसणममुयंतस्स[3] हु परिवडणं णत्थि ससारे ॥	52-4	43-44	20 also 90*28, -29,-30	18, 105-6	Bh 65
740	सुद्धे सम्मत्ते अविरदो वि अज्जेदि तित्थयरणामकम्मं। जादो खु सेणिगो आगमेसिं अरुहो अविरदो वि ॥	55	46	21 also 90*31	19,107	Bh 67
7!6	एया वि सा समत्था जिणभत्ती दुग्गई णिवारेदुं। पुण्णाणि य पूरेदुं आसिद्धिपरंपरसुहाणं ॥*	56	58	90*32	113	
[747]	तह सिद्धचेदिए पवयणे य आइरियसव्वसाधूसुं। भत्ती होदि समत्था ससारुच्छेदणे तिव्वा ॥*	57	68			
748	विज्जा वि भत्तिवंतस्स सिद्धिमुवयादि होदि सफला य। किध पुण णिव्वुदिबीजं सिज्झहिदि अभत्तिमंतस्स ॥	58	76			
[752]	वंदणभत्तीमित्तेण मिहिलाहिओ य पउमरहो। देविंदपाडिहेरं पत्तो जादो गणधरो य ॥	59	77			
759	अण्णाणी वि य गोवो आराधित्ता मदो णमोक्कारं। चंपाए सेट्ठिकुले जादो पत्तो य सामण्णं ॥	60	78	23	21	Bh 81
772	जइ दा खंडसिलोगेण जमो मरणादो फेडिदो राया। पत्तो य सुसामण्ण किं पुण जिणउत्तसुत्तेण ॥ वि—वाक्यमन्त्राख्यानकं च।	61	81	24	22	=Bh 87
773	दढसुप्पे सूलहदो पंचणमोक्कारमेत्तसुदणाणे। उवजुत्तो कालगदो देवो जादो महड्ढीओ ॥	62 also 63-70	82 83-97	25	23	
794	जीववहो अप्पवहो जीवदया होदि अप्पणो हु दया। विसकंटओ व्व हिंसा परिहरियव्वा तदो होदि ॥	71 also 72	97 98		25	
799	मारेदि एगमवि जो जीवं सो बहुसु जम्मकोडीसु। अवसो मारिज्जंतो मरदि विधाणेहिं बहुगेहिं ॥	73[1]	99(?)			
822	पाणो वि पाडिहेरं पत्तो छूढो वि सुंसुमारहदे। एक्केण अप्पकालक्कदेण ऽहिंसावदगुणेण ॥	74	99	26	24	=S,96
837	सच्चं वदंति रिसओ रिसीहिं विहिदाओ सव्वविज्जाओ। मिच्छस्स वि सिज्झंति य विज्जाओ सच्चवादिस्स ॥	75	100			

[1] Compare verse No 305 of this story

Nos	Bhagavatī Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK	PK	NK	Others
849	पावस्सागमदारं असच्चवयणं भणंति हु जिणिंदा। हिदएण अपावो वि हु मोसेण गदो वसू णिरयं ॥	76	100	27	26	Bh.101
[859]	अत्थम्मि हिदे पुरिसो उम्मत्तो विगदचेयणो होदि। मरदि व हक्कारकिदो अत्थो जीवं खु पुरिसस्स ॥	77	104			
874	परदव्वहरणबुद्धी सिरिभूदी णयरमज्झयारम्मि। होदूण हदो पहदो पत्तो सो दीहसंसारं ॥	78	104	5, 28	5, 27	
[876]	देविंदरायगहवइदेवदसाहम्मिउग्गहं तम्हा। उग्गहविहिणा दिण्णं गेण्हसु सामण्णसाहणयं ॥	79				
909	णीचं पि कुणदि कम्मं कुलपुत्तदुगुंछियं विगदमाणो। वारत्तिगो वि कम्मं अकासी जह लंघियाहेदुं ॥ वि—वारत्तिगो नाम यति। मू—वारत्तओ वारत्रको नाम यतिः।	80	108	29		
915	बारस वासाणि वि संवसित्तु कामादुरो ण णासीय। पादगुदठमसतं गणियाए गोरसदीवो ॥ मू—गोरसंदीवो मुनिनामेदम्।	81	109	30		
935	इहलोए वि महल्लं दोसं कामस्स वसगदो पत्तो। कालगदो वि य पच्छा कडारपिंगो गदो णिरयं ॥ वि—वाच्यमत्राख्यानम्।	82	110	31	29	
[942]	आसीय महाजुद्धाइं इत्थीहेदुं जणम्मि बहुगाणि। भयजणणाणि जणाणं भारहरामायणादीणि ॥	83-4				
[949]	साकेदपुराधिवदी देवरदी रज्जसोक्खपब्भट्ठो। पंगुलहेदुं छूढो णदीए रत्ताए देवीए ॥ वि—गन्धर्वप्रवीणेन पङ्गुना सह जीवितुमभिलषन्त्या।	85	112	32	30	=Bh 122
[950]	ईसालुयाए गोववदीए गामकूडधूदियासीसं। छिण्णं पहदो तध भल्लएण पासम्मि सीहबलो ॥	86	112	33	31	
[951]	वीरवदीए सूलगदचोरदट्ठोट्ठिगाए वाणियगो। पहदो दत्तो य तहा छिण्णो ओट्ठो त्ति आलविदो ॥	87	113	34	32	
999	अग्घेण ण वूढाओ[1] जलंतघोरग्गिणा ण दड्ढाओ[2]। सप्पेहिं सावज्जेहिं वि हरिदा खद्धा ण काओ वि[3]॥[*] मू—काञ्चन शीलवत्यः सुलोचनादयः।	88-89 90	113f			

Nos	Bhagavatī Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK.	PK	NK	Others
1061	साधुं पडिलाहेदुं गदस्स सुरयस्स अग्गमहिसीए। णट्ठं सदीए अंगं कोढेण जहा मुहुत्तेणं ॥ वि—सुरतनामधेयस्य राज्ञः। सदीए सत्या शोभनायाः।	91	114	35	33	
[1063-5]	वग्घपरद्धो लग्गो मूले य जहा ससप्पबिलपडिदो। पडिदमधुबिंदुभक्खणरदिओ मूलम्मि छिज्जंते ॥ तह चेव मच्चुवग्घपरद्धो बहुदुक्खसप्पबहुलम्मि। संसारबिले पडिदो आसामूलम्मि संलग्गो ॥ बहुविग्घमूसगेहिं आसामूलम्मि तम्मि छिज्जंते। लेहदि विभयविलज्जो अप्पसुहं विसयमधुबिंदुं ॥	92	114	36	34	
1082	जादो खु चारुदत्तो गोठ्दीदोसेण तह विणीदो वि। गणियासत्तो मज्जासत्तो कुलदूसओ य तहा ॥	93	114	37	35	
[1100]	सगडो हु जउणिगाए ससम्मीए दु चरणपब्भट्ठो। गणियासंसग्गीए य कूववारो तहा णट्ठो ॥ मू-जउणियाए जैनिकानाम्न्या ब्राह्मण्या.	94 95	118 119	38 39		
[1101]	रुद्दो[1] परासरो[2] सच्चई[3] य रायरिसि[4] देवपुत्तो[6] य। महिलारूवालोई णट्ठा ससत्तदिट्ठीए ॥	96-99	119-24	40-43	36-38	
[1128]	गंथो भयं णराणं सहोदरा एयरत्थजा जं ते। अण्णोण्णं मारेदुं अत्थणिमित्तं मदिमकासी ॥	100	125	44	39	
[1129]	अत्तणिमित्तमदिभयं जादं चोराणमेक्कमेक्केहिं। मज्जे मंसे य विसं सजोइय मारिया जं ते।	101	125	45	40	
1130-32	सगो महाभयं जं विहेडिदो सावगेण सतेण। पुत्तेण चेवा अत्थे हिदम्हि णिहिदिल्लगे साहुं ॥ दूओ[1] बंभण[2] विग्घो[3] लेओ[4] हत्थी[5] य तह य रायसुयं[6]। पहिय[7] णरो[8] वि य राया[9] सुवण्णयारस्स अक्खाणं[10] ॥* वण्णर[1] णउलो[2] विज्जो[3] वसहो[4] तावस[5] तहेव चूतवणं[6]। रक्ख[7] सिवण्णी[8] डुंडुह[9] मेदज्जमुणिस्स[10] अक्खाणं ॥*	102	125f	46	41	=Bh 133
[1140]	अत्थणिमित्तं घोरं परितावं पाविदूण कंपिल्ले। लहुअं संपत्तो णिरयं पिण्णागगंधो खु ॥	104	128	47	42	
[1144]	पढहत्थस्स ण तित्ती आसी य महाधणस्स लुद्धस्स। संगेसु मुच्छिदमदी जादो सो दीहससारी ॥	105	129	48	43	
[1218]	कुद्धो वि अप्पसत्थं मरणे पत्थेदि परवधादीयं। जह उग्गसेणघादे कदं णिदाणं वसिट्ठेण।	106	134	49	44	

Nos	Bhagavatī Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK	PK	NK	Others
[1222]	सो भिंदइ लोहत्थं णावं भिंदइ मणिं च सुत्तत्थं। छारकदे गोसीरं डहदि णिदाणं खु जो कुणदि ॥ वि-सारविनाशसाधर्म्यादमेवमाचष्टे-सूपकारोपरि कथा यो निदानकारी, तेन नौप्रभृतिकं विनाशितम्।	107				
[1236]	कुणदि य माणो णीयागोदं पुरिसं भवेसु बहुगेसु। पत्ता हु णीचजोणी बहुसो माणेण लच्छिमदी।	108	137	50	45	
1281	संभूदो वि णिदाणेण देवसोक्खं च चक्कधरसोक्खं। पत्तो तत्तो य चुदो उववण्णो णिरयवासम्मि ॥ मू-चक्कधरसोक्खं ब्रह्मदत्ताख्यद्वादशचक्रवर्तिशर्म।	109	138			
[1286]	पब्भट्ठबोधिलाभा मायासल्लेण आसि पूदिमुही। दासी सागरदत्तस्स पुप्फदंता हु विरदा वि ॥	110	138	51	56	
[1287]	मिच्छत्तसल्लदोसा पियधम्मो साधुवच्छलो संतो। बहुदुक्खे संसारे सुचिरं पडिहिंडिओ मरिची ॥	111	139	52	47	
[1333]	कुलजस्स जस्समिच्छंतगस्स णिधणं वरं खु पुरिसस्स। ण य दिक्खिदेण इंदियकसायवसिएण जीविदुं जे।	112	139			
[1355]	सरजूए गंधमित्तो घाणिंदियवसगदो विणीदाए। विसगंधपुप्फमग्घाय मदो णिरयं च संपत्तो ॥ मू-विणीदाए अयोध्याया स्वामी। विसपुप्फगंधं ज्योष्ठभ्रातृप्रयुक्तरौद्रविषरजोवासितसुरभितमकुसुमगन्धम्।	113	139	53	48	
[1356]	पाडलिपुत्ते पंचालगीदसद्देण मुच्छिदा संती। पासादादो पडिदा णट्ठा गंधव्वदत्ता वि ॥	114	140	54	49	
[1357]	माणुसमंसपसत्तो कंपिलवदी तधेव भीमो वि। रज्जभट्ठो णट्ठो मदो य पच्छा गदो णिरयं ॥	115	140	55	50	
[1358]	चोरो वि तह सुवेगो महिलारूवम्मि रत्तदिट्ठीओ। विद्धो सरेण अच्छीसु मदो णिरयं च संपत्तो ॥	116	141	56		
[1359]	फासिंदिएण गोवे सत्ता गिहवदिपिया वि णासक्के। मारेदूण सपुत्तं धूयाए मारिदा पच्छा ॥ वि-गिहवदिपिया राष्ट्रकूटभार्या।	117	141	57	51	
[1374]	बारवदी य असेसा दड्ढा दीवायणेण रोसेण। बद्धं च तेण पावं दुग्गदिभयबंधणं घोरं ॥	118	142	58	52	

Nos	Bhagavatī Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK	PK.	NK	Others
[1381]	सट्ठिं साहस्सीओ पुत्ता सगरस्स रायसीहस्स। अदिबलवेगा संता णट्ठा माणस्स दोसेण॥	119	143	59	54	
[1388]	सस्सो य भरधगामस्स सत्तसंवच्छराणि णिस्सेसो। दड्ढो इंभणदोसेण कुंभकारेण रुट्ठेण॥	120	143	60		
[1392]	सव्वे वि गंथदोसा लोभकसायस्स हुंति णादव्वा। लोभेण चेव मेहुणहिंसालियचोज्जमाचरदि॥	121	143	61	55	
[1393]	रामस्स जामदग्गिस्स वज्जं घित्तूण कत्तिविरिओ वि णिधणं पत्तो सकुलो ससाहणो लोभदोसेण।	122	144	62	56	
[1518]	को णाम भडो कुलजो माणी थोलाइदूण जणमज्झे। जुज्झे पलाइ आवडिदमेत्तओ चेव अरिभीदो॥	123				
[1526]	गाढप्पहारसंताविदा वि सूरा रणे अरिसमक्खं। ण मुहं भंजंति सगं मरंति भिउडीए सह चेव।	124	145			
[1528]	केई अग्गिमदिगदा समंतओ अग्गिणा वि डज्झंता। जलमज्झगदा व णरा अच्छंति अचेदणा चेव॥	125				
[1539]	भल्लुंकीए तिरत्तं खज्जंतो घोरवेदणट्टो वि। आराधणं पवण्णो झाणेणावंतिसुकुमालो॥	126	145	63	57	=Bh 160 M 435-9 S 65-6 V 1
[1540]	मोग्गिलगिरिम्मि य सुकोसलो वि सिद्धत्थदइय-भयवंतो। वग्घीए वि खज्जंतो पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्ठं॥	127	148	64	58	=Bh 161 M 466-7 S 63-4 V 2
[1541]	भूमीए समं कीलाकोट्टिददेहो वि अल्लचम्मं व। भयवं पि गयकुमारो पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्ठं॥	128	152	65	59	S 87 V 3
[1542]	कच्छुजरखाससोसो भत्तच्छदच्छिकुच्छिदुक्खाणि। अधियासियाणि सम्मं सणक्कुमारेण वाससयं॥	129	152	3, 66		V 4
[1543]	णावाए णिब्बुडाए गंगामज्झे अमुज्झमाणमदी। आराधणं पवण्णो कालगओ एणियापुत्तो॥	130	153	67	60	S 56-7 V 5
[1544]	ओमोदरिए घोराए भद्दबाहू असंकिलिट्ठमदी। घोराए तिगिंछाए पडिवण्णो उत्तमं ठाणं॥	131	153	68	61	V 6
[1545]	कोसंबीललियघडा वूढा णइपूरएण जलमज्झे। आराधणं पवण्णा पाओवगदा अमूढमदी॥*	132	155	69	62	S 79-80 V. 7

Nos	Bhagavatī Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK	PK	NK	Others
[1546]	चंपाए मासखमणं करित्तु गंगातडम्मि तण्हाए। घोराए धम्मघोसो पडिवण्णो उत्तमं ठाणं।	133	155	70	63	V 8
[1547]	सीदेण पुव्ववइरिदेवेण विकुव्विएण घोरेण। संतत्तो सिरिदिण्णो पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्टं॥	134	156	71	64	V 9
[1548]	उण्हं वादं उण्हं सिलादलं आदयं च अदिवण्हं। सहिदूण उसहसेणो पडिवण्णो उत्तम अट्ठं॥	135	156	72	65	V 10
[1549]	रोहेडयम्मि सत्तीए हवो कोंचेण अग्गिदइदो वि। तं वेदणमदियासिय पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्टं॥ मू-अग्निराजनाम्नो राज्ञ पुत्रः कार्तिकेयसंज्ञ ।	136	157	73	66	S. 67-9 V 11
[1550]	काइंदिअभयघोसो वि चंडवेगेण छिण्णसव्वंगो। तं वेयणमधियासिय पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्टं। मू-चंडवेगेण चण्डवेगनाम्ना राजपुत्रेण ।	137	158	74	67	S 76-8 V 12
[1551]	दंसेहिं य मसएहि य खज्जंतो वेदणं परं घोरं। विज्जुचरोऽधियासिय पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्टं॥ वि-विद्युच्चरचोर ।	138	159	75	68	V 13
[1552]	हत्थिणपुरगुरुदत्तो सबलिथाली व दोणिमंतम्मि। डज्झंतो अधियासिय पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्ठ॥ मू-बहुशिम्बिपूरितमर्कपत्रप्रच्छादितमथोमुख- भाजनं सर्वत्राग्निसवेष्टितं सबलिस्थालीत्युच्यते।	139	160	76	69	S 85 V 14
[1553]	गाढप्पहारविद्धो मूइंगलियाहिं चालणी व कदो। तध वि य चिलादपुत्तो पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्टं॥	140	162	77	70	Bh 88 M 427-30 S. 86 V 15
[1554]	धण्णो जउणावंकेण तिक्खकंडेहिं पूरिदंगो वि। तं वेयणमधियासिय पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्टं॥ वि-दडो दण्डनामको यतिः। मू-धण्णो धन्योनाम मुनि । दंडो इत्यन्ये। जमुणावंकेण यमुनावक्रनाम्ना राज्ञा।	141	163	78	71	M 465 S 61-2 V 16
[1555]	अभिणंदणादिगा पंचसया मयरम्मि कुंभकारकडे। आराधणं पवण्णा पीलिज्जता वि जंतेण।	142	163	79	72	M 443 S 58-60 V 17
[1556]	गोट्टे पाओवगदो सुबंधुणा गोव्वरे पलिविदम्मि। डज्झंतो चाणक्को पडिवण्णो उत्तमं अट्टं॥*	143	164	80	73	=Bh 162 S. 73-75 V 18
[1557]	वसदीए पलिविदाए रिट्ठामच्चेण उसहसेणो वि। आराधणं पवण्णो सह परिसाए कुणालम्मि॥	144	165	81	74	S 81-4 V 19

Nos	Bhagavatī Ārādhanā	HK	ŚK.	PK	NK	Others
[1633]	अरहंतसिद्धकेवलिअधिउत्त सव्वसंघसक्खिस्स। पच्चक्खाणस्स कदस्स भंजणादो वरं मरणं॥ मू-प्रत्याख्याताहारसेवनादित्यर्थ ।	145	165			
[1643]	होई णरो णिल्लज्जो पयहइ तवणाणदंसणचरित्तं। आमिसकलिणा ठइओ छायं मइलेइ य कुलस्स॥ वि-आमिषाख्येन कलीनावष्टब्ध. छायां कुलस्य मलिनयति परोच्छिष्टभोजनादिना।	146[1]	166			
[1649]	अवधिट्ठाणं णिरयं मच्छा आहारहेदु गच्छंति। तत्थेवाहारभिलासेण गदो सालिसित्थो वि। वि-आहारलोलुपतया स्वयंभूरमणसमुद्रे तिमितिमिं गिलादयो मत्स्या महाकाया योजनसहस्रायामाः षण्मास विवृतवदना स्वपन्ति। निद्राविमोक्षा- नन्तरं पिहितानना: स्वजठरप्रविष्टमत्स्यादी- नाहारीकृत्य अवधिष्ठाननामधेयं नरकं प्रविशंति। तत्कर्णावलग्नमलाहारा शालिसिक्थमात्रतनु- त्वाच्च शालिसिक्थसञ्ज्ञका यदीदृशमस्माकं शरीरं भवेत् किं नि सर्तुं एकोऽपि जन्तुर्लभते सर्वान् भक्षयामि इति कृतप्रणिधानास्ते तमेवावधि- स्थानं प्रविशन्ति।	147	166	82	75	
[1650]	चक्कधरो वि सुभूमो फलरसगिद्धीए वंचिओ संतो। णट्ठो समुद्दमज्झे सपरिजणो तो गओ णिरयं॥	148	166	83	76	
[1716]	लोगो विलीयदि इमो फेणो व्व सदेवमाणुसतिरिक्खो। रिद्धीओ सव्वाओ सुविणगसंदंसणसाओ॥	149				
[1800]	जणणी वसततिलया भगी कमला य आसि भज्जाओ। धणदेवस्स य एक्कम्मि भवे ससारवासम्मि॥	150	166	84		
[1802]	कुलरूवतेयभोगाधिगो वि रया विदेहदेसवदी। वच्चघरम्मि सुभोगो जाओ कीडो सकम्मेहिं।	151	168	85	77	
[1804]	इधइं परलोगे वा सत्तू पुरिसस्स हुंति णीया वि। इहइं परत्त वा खाई पुत्तमंसाणि सयमादा॥	152	168			
[1806]	विमलाहेदुं वंकेण मारिदो णिययमारियागब्भे। जादो जादो जादिभरो सुदिट्ठी सकम्मेहिं॥	153	168	86	78	

[1] Compare especially verse No 15 from that story

Nos	Bhagavati Ārādhanā	HK.	ŚK	PK	NK	Others
[2073]	कोसलयधम्मसीहो अट्ठं साधेदि गिद्धपुट्ठेण । णयरम्मि य कोल्लगिरे चंदसिरिं विप्पजहिदूण ॥*	154	168	87	79	S. 70-1
[2074]	पाडलिपुत्ते धूदाहेदुं मामयकदम्मि उवसग्गो । साधेदि उसभसेणो अट्ठं विक्खाणस किच ॥*	155	169	88	80	
[2075]	अहिमारएण णिवदिम्मि मारिदे गहिदसमणलिंगेण । उड्डाहपसमणत्थं सत्थग्गहणं अकासि गणी ॥* मू-अहिमारएण अहिमारकनाम्ना बुद्धोपासकेन । णिवदिम्मि स्रावस्तिकानगरीनाथे जयसेनाख्ये । गणी यतिवृषभनामाचार्य ।	156	169	89	81	
[2076]	सगडालएण वि तडा सत्थग्गहणेण साधीदो अत्थो । वररुइपओगहेदुं रुट्ठे णंदे महापउमे ॥*	157	170	90	82	

Mutual relation etc , of some of these Kośas have been partly noted above (p 62 f), and the relation of Harisena's Kathākośa with other Kośas would be discussed below

6 HARISENA'S KATHĀKOŚA A STUDY

(i) Name, Extent etc

Harisena's Treasury of stories has attracted the attention of scholars from a pretty long time Though the text was not printed, the story of Bhadrabāhu was used by Rice, Narasimhacharya[1] and others in their discussion about the migration of the Jaina Sangha to the South, especially to Śravana Belgola, when a severe famine raged in Northern India Pt Premi published its *praśasti* and introduced it to Hindi readers, and lately he has revised some of his earlier opinions[2] There has appeared a Marāthī digest of a portion of it[3]

Now it has been abundantly clear to us that this Treasury of stories presents a series of tales which illustrate the veiled and explicit allusions found in the Bha Ārādhanā Not only this relation is well established but all the stories are also serially associated with the gāthās from that work[4] In the absence of their context in the Bha Ā , the stories, though quite significant individually and showing some affinity of subject-matter among themselves in small groups, stand without mutual connection and continuity as such Harisena has not given the gāthās with which the stories are to be associated, and he gives very

[1] Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions pp 2 f , Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol II, 1st and 2nd eds , Bangalore 1889 and 1923, Intro pp 37f of the 2nd ed

[2] Jaina Hitaishī, 14, pp 216-18, Jaina Sāhitya Samśodhaka I, 1, 59-62, Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, pp 434-9

[3] Bṛhatkathākośa, part 1 (stories 1-66, the last story being that of Mṛgasena), by Ajñāta, Osmanabad, Vīra Sam 2463

[4] See Section 5 above where the gāthās and the corresponding stories from different Kośas are noted.

little hint on this point by saying that the Kathākośa composed by him is *ārādhanoddhṛta* (Praśasti 8), meaning thereby that the stories are drawn out, extracted or chosen from the Ārādhanā which stands for the Bhagavatī Ā. perhaps inseparably connected with some Prākrit commentary that gave all these tales We cannot easily take *ud dhṛ* in the sense of *uddhṛ* and argue that they are illustrative stories on the Ārādhanā gāthās. Hariṣeṇa uniformly calls this treasury, Kathākośa; and he has not added any specification like Prabhācandra and Nemidatta who qualify their Kathākośas by the term Ārādhanā There are two colophons which mention the name as Bṛhat Kathākośa (pp 276 foot-note 1 and 356); but it is equally possible that these might belong to the copyists The Praśasti mentions the name Kathākośa, and it is likely that later on the adjective Bṛhat came to be added perhaps to distinguish it from smaller collections of Prabhācandra and Nemidatta, and on the analogy of Bṛhatkathā etc. This title, being already accepted in circulation, has been retained in this edition The term *bṛhat* connotes bulk and extent, so it is difficult to say whether it is anticipated by the adjective *param* in one of the Mangala verses (No 3)

The total Grantha-saṃkhyā is given to be 12500 Ślokas Apart from the Mangala and Praśasti sections, the text is said to contain 157 stories The story No 102 contains ten sub-stories, and I have already shown above (p 5 of the Intro) how a slight readjustment is necessary to arrive at the correct number of stories The whole work is composed mostly in Anustubh metre, and a few longer metres, some quoted and some composed by the author himself, are found here and there Among the quotations there are Anustubhs as well as Prākrit gāthās Almost all the quotations are anonymous, they are not necessarily introduced by the phrase *tathā coktam* etc , and there are reasons to believe that some verses, which form a part of the running text, might turn out to be quotations[1] In the extent of individual Kathānakas there is a good deal of disparity the shortest (No 125) contains 4 verses and the longest (No 57) 585 verses

(ii) Various Strata of the contents etc

All these stories have their seeds in the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā which is primarily a religious scripture meant mainly for the study of Śramaṇas, and consequently their background and outlook are predominantly religious and ascetical As it is usual with Jaina tales, many of the stories deal with the biographies not only of individuals but also of their souls migrating through various births This naturally leads to the emboxing of subtales into tales, and the structure of the tale assumes some complexity For the author, however, this mode of composition has a two-fold advantage first, it gives him a sovereign method of illustrating the reward of virtues and punishment of vices in a subsequent birth, if not in this, and thus strengthens the faith of pious believers in the potentiality of moral values and the inviolability of the omnipotent law of Karman which automatically works and necessarily accompanies the doctrine of transmigration so far as Jainism is concerned, and secondly, it affords an opportunity for the author to present the same character in its various facets and under varying conditions through the infinite vista of the soul's journey. Chances, accidents, mishaps and traits of individual character, which usually control and guide the threads of the story, are all traced back to some Karman or the other in one of the past lives At times a pair of souls is selected and their fate,

[1] See my remarks on some of these quotations in the Notes at the end

in relation to each other, is elaborated through the tedious journey of Samsāra (No 109)[1] Some of the lengthy stories (Nos 56-7, 73 etc) do show these traits; and they assume an awful dignity which evokes sympathy for the characters that are suffering for their sins which the reader would like to avoid, of course sub-consciously, in his daily conduct, and thus escape the sad lot which faces the sinner elsewhere Almost as a corollary from this we find here an enormous bulk of stories in which various religious virtues are illustrated. some specifically pertain to the ascetic life and some to that of a house-holder Their number is pretty big in this book, and they comprise Jaina tenets connected with Samyaktva (Nos 4-12, 52-5, 63-71, 111), Ālocanā and Pratyākhyāna (Nos 14-16), the nature of Samsāra and the rarity of human birth etc , (Nos 35-44, 92, 149-53), devotion to religion, scripture, teacher and religious observances (Nos 13, 22, 29, 47-51, 56-62), the five Vratas (Nos 46, 72-9, 126), control of passions and subjugation of senses (Nos 28, 81-91, 93-110, 112-22, 147-8), stray virtues and practices (Nos 17-21, 23-30, 33-4, 45, 80), putting up with Parīsahas, and facing death quietly and courageously (Nos 1-2, 124-5, 154-7) Then we have a substantial stratum of ascetic tales (Nos 126-46 etc) giving some biographical details about great ascetics who patiently endured various hardships and attained the highest spiritual object, and some of them are common to both Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras It is highly probable that at least some names are historical and have been handed down to posterity as inspiring ideals of ascetic culture to be followed as examples by those that want to lead a monastic life There are a few stories which are not only sectarian and propagandistic but preach also pious rituals consisting of fasts etc (Nos 57, 59 etc) The repetition of Pañcanamaskāra is attended with some miraculous power that comes to one's rescue in adversity and any attempt to dishonour it leads to ruin (Nos 52, 60, 62-3) There is a small section at the beginning of story No 46 which can be called a purely dogmatic discourse, and the whole text is replete with references to Jaina dogmas and technical terms Besides ethical preachings, we come across some philosophical discussions too (No 73) In many of these tales what matter most are the motif and crucial details and not the various names scattered throughout the frame-work of the narrative

In spite of the religious spirit permeating almost all the stories, this Kośa is not altogether devoid of secular interest Tales which have nothing specially religious about them but which are primarily meant for amusement and general instruction of worldly wisdom are scattered all over this work, at times subordinated to the mission of religio-moral instruction which the author has on his hand The narratives, Liquor-vendor and Brahmin, Owl and Swan, Parrots in good and bad Company, Housewife and Mungoose, Physicians and Tiger etc (Nos 31-33, 102*2-*3) are fables meant for didactic instruction, and their frame-work, ideology etc , not only remind us of the class of literature to which Pañcatantra etc , belong but one of them (102*2) is found also in the Pañcatantra V. Their concluding verses are similar to those in the Jātakas and sayings of worldly wisdom found in texts like the Pañcatantra Some of the Kathānakas narrated by Yamapāśa in the royal assembly (No 63) belong to this type There are a few genuine folktales incorported in some of our stories, and their motifs are well-known in other branches of Indian literature: No 21 brings out a contrast between a good wife and a bad one; the Kāyastha misreads

[1] Bloomfield has already noted that such illustrations are found in plenty in the narrative literature of the Jainas in particular and of India in general, see Life and Stories of the Jaina Saviour Pārśvanātha, Baltimore 1919, Intro pp 13-6

the father's letter (reading perhaps *andhāpaya* for *adhyāpaya* (No 23)[1], and once he reads *stabha* for *stambha* (No 25); Abhayakumāra skilfully meets the royal orders to fetch a well from a village, to weigh an elephant, to shift a well to the west of the village etc (No 55, see also No 157), a go-between outwits the gate-keepers and brings the required lover to the queen (No 60); and lastly an innocent cartman is duped by the villagers (No 120) The tests put by Ksīrakadambaka on the wisdom of his pupils (No 70) are certainly a few amusing bits from popular stories There is no piece of folk-tale which is foreign to our author and which cannot be improved upon for religious edification, if it can be made to illustrate the virtue which he wants to preach There are other contexts which give interesting insight into the complicate workings of human mind at times plainly illustrated and at times symbolically put we come across an avaricious merchant (No 104), a greedy maternal uncle (No 105), a treacherous wife (Nos 85, 87), a jealous cowife (No 86), a noble and self-sacrificing husband (No 85), a passionate monk (Nos 81, 95, 98), a loving mother (No 145) etc, and once a lover, endowed with miraculous power, converts himself into a bee and hovers round the face of his beloved (No 80) Then it is some technical terms, on account of their specific and obscure meanings, that have given rise to a few anecdotes *viṣānna*=special, rich and flavoury food which gives physical strength, lustre and vigour (No 6 20); *yauvana*=warmth or freshness of food (No 14 13), *maṣi*= husked and fresh *mudga* beans (No 24 37), and *collaka*=a specified dish (No 35 34-5)

The chief object of most of these tales is to edify Jainism and impress on the minds of readers the greatness and power of Jaina religion, and thus propagate in the society the religio-moral ideals upheld by Jainism These are not purely dogmatical and ethical discourses, but after all they are tales, and as such they are strewn with secular topics which also provide instruction and often give an agreeable entertainment

(iii) Cultural Heritage and Literary Kinship of this Work

In the light of the Vedic and Śramanic ideology, the outlines of which have been already sketched in short, a dispassionate evaluation of the contents of this Kathākośa definitely points to the fact that they stand for Śramanic ideology The Vedic cult of sacrifice, the priestly religion and rituals, the epic mythology and the doings of Purānic deities and personalities are referred to in this work only to be criticised and condemned On the other hand, nearly all the traits of Śramaṇic ideology, as inherited by Jainism, are admirably upheld throughout this book The doctrines of rebirth and Karman are illustrated almost by every lengthy tale The worldly possessions and pleasures have their worth, but it is low and ephemeral as compared with the bliss of Nirvāṇa In these tales are introduced the Tīrthakaras and eminent teachers who disillusion the worldly-minded people about their manifold attachment with the result that they grow pessimistic, are inspired by an optimistic disposition towards liberation, enter the ascetic order, and practise a severe monastic course putting up with all sorts of hardships They have very little attachment even for the body which they fully use for spiritual meditation Physical comforts have no allurement for them, and they gradually grow so indifferent and plunge themselves in self-absorption that no bodily pain, not even physical torture, disturbs their equanimity and peace The Ārādhanā tales about the ascetic martyrs, who are inspiring models

[1] It may be a confusion between the Prākrit forms *amdhāvehi* and *addhāvehi* or *amdhiyaü* and *adhiyaü*

for other monks fully confirm this Individual spiritual perfection is the highest religious ideal in tune with which the entire ethical code, in its two parts, one meant for householders and the other for monks, is laid down, and the moral outlook is evolved The vigilant law of Karman governs every one's destiny, and there is no place for any God bestowing favours and meeting out punishments There are, however, a few stories in which semi-divine or heavenly (to be distinguished from the liberated) beings and supernatural or miraculous powers come to the rescue of religious people at critical moments (Nos. 4, 7, 11, 16, 19, 26, 54, 64, 66, 113, 134, etc) Exceptional sanctity is bestowed on life, and Ahimsā is the highest moral principle guiding all human affairs The moral values and social virtues inculcated in these stories are usually those that are found accepted in Jainism They are so often preached and illustrated with a profuse use of Jaina technical terms that some stories become specifically sectarian, and direct and indirect attack is driven against other religions In some of the stories the Astāhnika-pūjā is referred to It is believed that gods etc , go to the Nandīśvara-dvīpa and offer worship to the natural deities in the 52 temples standing in four quarters there Corresponding to this the Jainas celebrate this Parvan thrice a year, in their temples, during the months of Āsādha, Kārtika and Phālguna from the 8th day to the Paurṇimā when fasts are observed and Pūjās performed It is also called Nandīśvara-parvan and Kaumudī-mahotsava, the latter being characterised by certain jubilant festivities on the day of Paurnimā or full moon During this Parvan, a declaration to the effect that no living being was to be killed was made, and there was celebrated the Ratha-yātrā also possibly in competition with that of the Buddhists and Brahmins (Nos 12, 33, 56-7, 63, 115, 134, 139) Other religious observances such as Rohinī- and Pañcamī-vrata are described in some tales (Nos 57, 124, 145) Brahman, Visnu, Rudra and Buddha are the popular non-Jaina deities mentioned in this text, and some antipathy is shown towards non-Jaina religions devoted to these deities (Nos 7, 33, 55, 96-7, 99, 122, 156 etc) A Tāpasa and a Bhāgavata are ridiculed in some stories (Nos 19, 106), and more than once the sacrificial cult, involving harm unto living beings, is condemned (Nos 11, 76, 93)

The very fact that all the stories from this Kośa arise from direct and indirect allusions found in the Bhagavatī Arādhanā shows that their motifs are pretty old There is every reason to believe that some of them were found in the canon, said to be lost now, but whose tables of contents have come down to us in the Digambara works The skeleton of a story from the Drstivāda is given in the Maranasamāhi, and some of the details of a story from this Kośa (No 78) have a close resemblance with it As far as ascetic tales are concerned, the Nos 126-8, 130, 132, 136-7, 193-44 etc have their basic references in the Paīnnas of the Ardhamāgadhī canon as well Some of the events and stories connected with Harivamśa in general and Krsna Vāsudeva in particular (Nos 11, 29, 34, 76, 78, 88, 93, 106, 108, 118 etc) have their counterparts in the canonical texts like the Antagadadasāo and other earlier texts like the Vasudevahindī of Sanghadāsa[1] and the Harivamśa of Jinasena[2] These Jaina sources contain much that is interesting and independent so far as Kṛṣna legend is concerned Dr Alsdorf[3] has critically studied them, and he remarks thus 'In all these [Jaina] versions one has to admit, to a greater or smaller degree, a secondary production from the literary tradition of the Brāhmanas By the expression

[1] Published in the Ātmānanda Jaina Granthamālā, vols 80-1, Bhavanagar 1931

[2] Published in the Māṇikachandra D Jaina Granthamālā, vols 31-2, Bombay

[3] Harivamśapurāṇa, Hamburg 1936, Intro pp 119-20

secondary is meant that in any case the original reception of the Kṛṣṇa and Mahābhārata sagas has not come from the Harivaṁśa or the Mahābhārata, at least not from the literary sources It is indeed long-known that the real ancient Jaina tradition possesses some amount of independence as against the Brahmanic one, and even occasionally, though in rare cases, has preserved an old original trait which is obliterated from the epic-Purāṇic tradition as available to us' The stories of Viṣṇukumāra, Kadāṛapinga, Cārudatta etc. (Nos 11, 82, 90) are traced to the Vasudevahiṇḍī (pp 120, 296) The details about the life of Cārudatta (No 90), who is closely associated with the Jaina Harivaṁśa, who with his companions like Marubhūti, Gomukha etc, and his connections with Kaliṅgasenā reminds us of some contexts in the Brhatkathā, and who has been immortalised by Bhāsa and Śūdraka in their plays, deserve to be studied critically with the help of Jaina and non-Jaina sources [1] The Pāṇḍava-legend, so far as the early Jaina sources like the Nāyādhammakahāo, Paiṇṇas etc, are concerned, is closely associated with the Krsṇa-legend in which Krsna figures as a brave hero We have in this Kośa a few tales connected with Pāṇḍavas (Nos 58, 83, 96) Once the author narrates the story according to the Mahābhārata, but condemns it as heretical and incredible (No 83 45-9) The killing of Paraśurāma on the field and subsequent destruction of Brāhmanas twentyone times by Subhūma (Nos 59, 122), which are also described in the Vasudevahiṇḍī, Harivamśa etc, only supplement the Paraśurāma-legend which we get in plenty in the Mahābhārata There is one story (No 84) which gives the Kathānaka of the Rāmāyana, and there is another (No 89) in which Sītā is passing through an ordeal after which she accepts Jaina renunciation under Samyamasena J Dahlmann[2] conjectures in his Genesis des Mahābhārata that there must have existed an independent heroic saga dealing with the conflict between Krṣṇa and Jarāsamdha in which the latter was killed by Krsna himself and only fragments of which are found in the present Mahābhārata where the act of killing is attributed to Bhīma That both Kamsa and Jarāsamdha are to be killed by Krsna Vāsudeva is specifically mentioned in one of our stories (No 106 198, 217) Some of the characters in Nos 143, 157 etc, figure also in the 4th and 5th Tarangas of the Kathāsaritsāgara, and they might go back to the original Brhatkathā The Jaina mythology recognises 12 Cakravartins (No 41 1-2) with whom are associated cycles of stories specimens of which, connected with Sagara, Sanatkumāra, Subhūma, Hariseṇa and Brahmadatta, are found in this work (Nos 119, 129, 122, 148, 33, 35, 52, 109) Among these Subhūma kills Paraśurāma, Sagara is well-known in Purānic mythology, and the legends about Brahmadatta are found in Jaina, Buddhist and Hindu works

Subsequent to the period of our Kathākośa, that is roughly after the first quarter of the 10th century A D, the Jaina contributions to Indian literature have been both extensive and interesting Space prohibits me from tracing the influence of these stories on later authors and noting the common points, wherever available, in different works It may be added, however, that there are a few stories, occupying just individual sections here, that have later on grown into independent themes on which series of authors have composed their works in different languages Harisena's Kathākośa being a dated work, the form and the contents of these stories would be of great help to those who want to study their motifs at different stages of Indian literature Some of the striking tales

[1] F Lacôte Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā, Paris 1908, and also its English translation in the Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore 1923

[2] I am thankful to Dr A. M Ghatge for kindly drawing my attention to this

of this type are those of Karkaṇḍa (No 56), Arhaddāsa (No 93) and Yaśodhara (No. 73) The story of Arhaddāsa is known later as Samyaktva-kaumudī

The above review makes it clear that many of the stories have so often appeared and reappeared, with or without variations, in different strata of Jaina literature in particular and Indian literature in general that it is necessary that individual stories, in view of their specific motifs and details, should be slected for intensive study, and their gradual evolution should be marked out at its various stages, separating the basic kernel from the incidental accretions and detached sub-stories As a preliminary step towards this study, both in the Introduction here and in the Notes at the end, I have tried to put together some useful references from different contexts which can be enriched by further studies

(iv) Interesting Social, Historical etc Bits of Information

In this Kathākośa of Harisena there is abundant information which would be interesting to a student of Indian religions in general and of Jainism in particular Some items I have already noted above This being a dated work of specified locality, the various bits of information of cultural interest have a definite chronological value, though it cannot be claimed that all of them belong only to the age and place of our author For a student of Indian folklore, who occupies himself with the study of customs, rites and beliefs which are current in the society in different places and at different times, there are some points of interest in our stories The geographical background of our author is primarily the Madhya-desa, that is central India and the adjoining territory He mentions some important towns of the South, and bears testimony to repeated communications between the Uttarā- and the Daksinā-patha (No 7 etc) More than once travels to distant countries by sea are mentioned, and once the Yavana script is referred to (No 22) There is an interesting mention of a rich Pārasīka who buys Cumkārikā, feeds her for six months, and takes blood with the help of leeches from her body, and it was used for dyeing Krmirāga-kambala (No 102* 1 80-2) The idea of using blood in preparing blanket-dye is recorded by Āśādhara also In explaining gāthā No 567 of the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā which runs thus

किमिरागकंबलस्स व सोधी जदुरागवत्थसोधीव।
अवि सा हवेज्ज किहइ ण तधिमा सल्लुद्धरणसोधी॥,

he remarks

किमिरायकंबलस्स कृमिभुक्ताहारवर्णतन्तुभिरूत कम्बल कृमिरागकम्बलस्तस्येति संस्कृतटीकायां व्याख्यानम्। टिप्पनके तु कृमिरागत्यक्तरक्ताहाररञ्जिततन्तुनिष्पादितकम्बलस्येति। प्राकृतटीकायां पुनरिदमुक्तम्-चर्मरङ्गम्लेच्छविषयेम्लेच्छा जलौकाभिर्मानुषरुधिरं गृहीत्वा भण्डकेषु स्थापयन्ति। ततस्तेन रुधिरेण कतिपयदिवसोत्पन्नविपन्नकृमिकेणोर्णासूत्रं रञ्जयित्वा कम्बलं वयन्ति। सोऽयं कृमिरागकम्बल इत्युच्यते। स चातीवरुधिरवर्णो भवति, तस्य हि वह्निना दग्धस्यापि स कृमिरागो नापगच्छतीति॥

Vidyādharas and Cārana monks are introduced in some stories (Nos 7, 11, 46 etc) Utterance of certain holy syllables leads to the acquisition of miraculous powers (Nos 4, 10 etc) Besides magical collyrium and pills (Nos 10, 63) and the medicinal effect of Gandhodaka (No 13), we get references to Ākāśa-and Śīghra-gāminī Vidyās, and the Vetāla Vidyā practised by a Kāpālika (Nos 4, 80, 64, 102) As useful information, we get a list

of articles of food (Nos 10 75-6), a reference to Laksapāka oil which is a patent medicine against skin-burning (No 102 25), an enumeration of different classes of serpents and their behaviour (Nos 10, 112), a statement of divisions of time (No 99 14), the description of Candrakavedha target (Nos 43, 57, 116), and the definitions of terms like *ibhya* etc , and *grāma* etc (Nos 87 5-7, 94 14-17) We find in one story that a burglar breaks open the door by throwing *sarṣapa* or mustard seeds against it (No 10 15) A poor Brahmin, with a *bījapūraka* or citron fruit in his hand, goes to a merchant, announces the birth of a son to him, and is amply rewarded in return by the merchant with the ornament on his body and one hundred villages (No 127 32-4) We get some forms of public condemnation here and there A culprit has his head besmeared with ashes or shaved leaving five tufts of hair and tied with *pañca-bilva,* his property is confiscated, and he is driven through the town on the back of an ass (Nos 11 139, 23 31, 24 38, 78 87, 82 39-40) Presentation of black clothes, of a pair of black oxen and of dark (or iron) impliments indicates contemptuous treatment (No 157 10) A messenger from an offensive party has his head cleanly shaved and his ears and nose chopped off (No 62 27-8) A student of fiction finds in this Kathākośa various motifs that are grouped under conventional captions[1] such as Biter bit (Nos 64-5, 72), Wicked ascetics (Nos 19, 64, 93 78, 102 9), Śibi motif (No 85 7f), Pistakurkuta (No 73 226), Elephant selecting an heir apparent included under Pañcadivyādhivāsa (No 56 258), Pregnancy whim (Nos 56 156 f , 106 129 f), Human sacrifices (No 73), Proclamation by drum (No 57 210), Immediate causes of renunciation like a momentary cloud, a grey hair etc , (57 452 and 574) These are not necessarily connected with Jaina dogmatics and religion

Then we get in this work some pieces of information referring to historical events It must be admitted at the outset that our author is not in any way contemporary with the events What he records is a tradition, it certainly carries a weight of evidence for the past as it occurs in a text of definite date and place, and, so far as the evidence of ancient India is concerned, nearer we push the tradition to the period of the event, more genuine is its authenticity and more credible its authority King Śreṇika, alias Bimbhasāra, who was a contemporary of Mahāvīra and who is known as Bimbisāra in Indian History, is a memorable figure in the Jaina tradition, and the entire Purāṇic lore of the Jainas, in one way or the other, centres round this great Magadhan king to whom we get repeated references in the canonical works of both Buddhists and Jainas It is just possible that facts and edificatory legends might have got mixed in course of time There are a few stories in this Kośa which deal with Śreṇika and his queen Celanā (Nos 9, 10, 55, 80, 130-40 etc) Though it presents some difficulties for a clear understanding and consequently needs careful collation and comparative study with other sources, both earlier and later, the story of Bhadrabāhu (No 131) is important in various respects it refers to the migration of Jaina Samgha to Punnāta territory in the Deccan[2] and to the division of twofold Kalpa, Jina- and Sthavira-kalpa, and outlines the circumstances under which Ardhaphālaka-samgha, Kāmbala-tīrtha and Yāpanīya-samgha[3] were started Quite casually, in one of the stories (No 97 198), the origin of Phallus worship is mentioned, and elsewhere we are informed

[1] The Life and Stories of the Jaina Saviour Pārśvanātha by M Bloomfield, Baltimore 1919, pp 183-207

[2] Epigraphia Carnatica, II, Intro pp 37 etc , also The Traditional Chronology of the Jainas by S Shaha, pp 45 f , Stuttgart 1935

[3] Journal of the University of Bombay, vol I, part vi, May 1933, Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, pp 51-60.

that Sāṁkhya religion was preached by Marīci (No 11 14) Well known figures like Cāṇakya, Vararuci, Kārtikeya are introduced in some of the stories (Nos 143, 157 and 136) The story No 26 gives an illustrative anecdote incorporating the historical facts about the composition of the Satkhandāgama by Puspadanta and Bhūtabali who are mentioned here as Devabali and Puśpabali, and we get these details confirmed from other sources also The story number 12, verse 132, refers to the founding of five Stūpas at Mathurā of which the Jaina Stūpas are well known Somadeva also refers in his Yaśastilakacampū to the Devanirmitastūpa at Mathurā in a similar story It has to be seen whether there was, or there are any relics of, a group of five Stūpas at that place In this context I am reminded of the facts that the Nirgrantha Śramaṇācārya Guhanandin (Samvat 159) is called Pañcastūpa-nikāyika and that Vīrasena and Jinasena belonged to Pañcastūpānvaya[1] Lastly, so far we know, Harisena is the first author to describe the caves on the hills adjoining Dhārāśiva (modern Osmanabad) near Tera which according to this text is situated in the Abhīra country (No 56) It is an urgent need that these topics should be critically studied using all other sources, and then alone it would be possible to separate historical events from their legendary settings

(v) Its Relation with Other Kathākośas

Among the four Kathākośas, or even five if we treat Vaddārādhane as a partial Kathākośa, whose story-numbers have been tabulated above along with the Ārādhanā gāthās, Hariseṇa's Treasury contains the biggest number of tales, its text is the longest in extent, it is the earliest in time, generally its stories are comparatively more exhaustive than those in other Sanskrit collections, and lastly the correspondence of its stories with the gāthās of the Bha Ā is more exhaustive and perfect, and thorough in sequence It is really unfortunate that no Ārādhanā Kośa earlier than that of Harisena has come to light, so for the present there is no evidence to assess his indebtedness to his predecessors

The four Kathākośas clearly fall into two groups those of Harisena (HK) and Śrīcandra (ŚK) show closer kinship and stand together, while those of Prabhācandra (PK) and Nemidatta (NK) show a close mutual relation and form a group by themselves almost independently Whenever we want to compare these groups or works mutually, we should not lose sight of the basic connection with those direct and indirect allusions in the Bha Ārādhanā A close comparison of HK with ŚK discloses some interesting facts Reading these two texts side by side, one is struck by the remarkable agreement in the sequence of stories adopted by both The essential contents of individual stories are nearly identical in both, so far as descriptions, details about Bhavas and sub-stories are concerned, HK is more exhaustive, almost in every case the stories from ŚK look like summaries of the corresponding stories of HK, and when the contents are alike, the verbal agreement also is striking. Though Śrīcandra is silent in the matter, the above points lead us to the conclusion that he might have used HK in preparing his Kośa For this conclusion we have some circumstantial evidence too Harisena flourished earlier than Śrīcandra, Śrīcandra admits that Kathākośa was composed by many monk-poets before his time, Śrīcandra complains possibly against some predecessor who gave only the stories

[1] See Yaśastilakacampū, part ii, p 315, The Jaina Antiquary, VIII, 2, p 45, A list of the Inscriptions of Northern India in Brāhmī and derivative scripts, Epigraphia Indica XIX-XXIII, p 283, No. 2037, Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, p 497

without giving and explaining the contextual gāthās from the Bha. Ā., and we find that this complaint suits very well with HK which does not give the gāthās Going into more details, we find that Śrīcandra omits, sometimes silently and at times with specific remarks, some of the stories found according to corresponding sequence in HK I have not been able to detect in ŚK the tales corresponding to Nos 73, 79, 83-4, 90, 102* 9, 107, 123, 125, and 149 of HK With regard to Nos 73, 83 and 84, Śrīcandra plainly says that Yaśodhara's tale is too well-known to be given and the stories of Bhārata and Rāmāyaṇa are endless. This means that the stories were present in his sources, but he has not given them. As far as I have inspected the Ms , he quietly passes over the remaining numbers, and it is difficult to gauge the reasons of this omission There are reasons to believe that besides HK, Śrīcandra might have used other sources also including perhaps some commentaries on the Bha Ā Looking at the facts that Prabhācandra, Śrīcandra and Nemidatta quote the 2nd gāthā of Bha Ā (the first two, along with the first gāthā), that the colophons of some of the opening stories of PK and NK show that there could be some stories connected with Darśanoddyota, and that Śrīcandra also illustrates twofold Uddyotana, we are led to the presumption that in an earlier source some stories were connected with the 2nd gāthā of Bha Ā. which is not illustrated by Harisena in any way. In this context Śrīcandra gives the stories of Bharata and Jitaśatru as examples of Laukika and Lokottara Uddyotana, and for these there are no corresponding tales in HK Secondly, if ŚK were to be solely based on HK, it is difficult to explain certain phonetic difference seen in some of the proper names Śrīcandra reads Jasahara, Vissambhara, Doṇimamta and Kuccavāra (PK Dronīmatī 90*30, Kūcavāra 39), while Hariṣeṇa reads in corresponding contexts Yaśoratha, Visamdhara, Tonimam and Kūpakāra (Nos 5, 54, 95) Lastly, if Śrīcandra followed only the text of HK, apparently there is no reason why some of the Sanskrit verses, which are given by him as quotations, should widely differ in readings from those still present in the Kośa of Hariṣeṇa We might compare 54. 17-8, 57 518-9, and 143 37-39 with the extracts given by me in the Notes There are major differences in the readings, as they are being preserved in the body of an Apabhraṁśa text, that they are quotations is quite apparent, and if Śrīcandra took them from HK, he would not change them, because he is quoting So my explanation is that Śrīcandra has before him some additional sources, perhaps common with those used by Hariṣeṇa, Śrīcandra quotes them perhaps as they are, Hariṣena, however, retouches those verses because some of them are to form a part of his running Sanskrit text, and they are not necessarily quotations with him in the strict sense of the term Just in this manner Amitagati also rewrites in his own words some of the verses which stood as quotations in the Prākrit source used by him in composing his Dharmaparīkṣā[1] I have been able to detect at least one instance where Śrīcandra's quotation[2] is nearer the original, i e , Bha Ā 682, than that preserved in HK (No 57 531) Thus it is quite possible that Śrīcandra had before him the Kathākoṣa of Hariśena, but he appears to have used some additional sources, some at least perhaps common with those of HK, in composing his Apabhraṁśa Kośa.

Turning to the next group, we have already studied the relation between PK and NK the latter, though it omits some stories given by the former, is mainly indebted to PK and to Prabhācandra's commentary on the Ratnakaraṇḍaka There is one significant story

[1] See my paper Hariṣeṇa's Dharmaparīkṣā in Apabhraṁśa, Silver Jubilee Volume, Annals of the BORI, 1942

[2] See Notes on 57 531. See my paper 'Śrīcandra and his Apabh. Kathākośa' contributed to the Radha Kumuda Mookerji Presentation Volume which is awaiting publication

in NK, No 25, that of Mrgasena-dhīvara, which is not found in PK but is found in H
The story is nearly identical in contents, but there is nothing specifically common wh
would induce us to accept that NK is following HK Though the sequence of storie
disturbed by indiscriminate use of more than one source in compiling the Kathāk
is has to be admitted that Prabhācandra presents sufficient evidence to show that
stories are connected with the Bhaga Ā But this connection has become simply nomi
in the case of NK there are no introductory remarks, as in PK, connecting the sto
with the Bha Ā , some of the stories, which are legitimately connected with the Bha
and which are duly given by PK (PK Nos 29, 30, 40, 84 etc), Nemidatta omits, and we
not know why, and at the close of his work, he adds a few stories which are connec
with the Ratnakarandaka and the relation of which with Bha Ā in that context is diffic
to be established So it is not quite necessary to compare NK with HK in all the deta
We might simply note that the Nos 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 28 (compare HK 68), 53, 108-12 and 1
of NK have not got their counterparts in HK, and if we compare closely HK and PK
are doing the necessary justice to the second group too

Even a superficial comparison between HK and PK shows that the former conta
numerically 35 stories more, and every one of its story, whenever it is common, is lon
and gives more details HK is composed in verses, but PK is in prose with occasio
metrical quotations, and according to rough clerical calculation PK is just one-fifth of H
As seen from the table given above, many stories from HK are not found in PK, a f
stories from HK are given twice by PK, and what is more important, PK gives so
stories which have no counterparts in HK Of the eight stories (PK Nos 1-4, 7, 8,
and 18) which are additional in PK, No 3, the story of Sanatkumāra, which gives nearly
same details as in its No 66, can be easily equated with No 129 of HK Though t
contents of some stories are common with those of HK, it is reasonable to take that N
1-12 in HK form a solid block: the first four illustrate Uddyotana and the next eight
devoted to the limbs of Samyaktva The topics are connected with gāthā Nos 2, and 4
of the Bha Ā , therefore, though Harisena and Prabhācandra may differ among themselv
we have to admit that the stories given by them are not in any way foreign to an Ārādh
Kośa Nos 1, 2 and 4 give details about some eminent authors, namely, Pātrakesar
Akalanka and Samantabhadra, who are brilliant figures in the annals of Indian literat
and some of whose works have come down to us How far these details are histori
what are the earlier sources to confirm them, and what events can be accepted as histori
facts these are independent questions that must be tackled on their own merits, and t
these stories are inauthentic because Harisena has not included them in his work is
a relevant deduction, because Prabhācandra had before him other sources, his stories
legitimately Ārādhanā tales, and because he is not mechanically following Harisena
have assigned Prabhācandra to the close of the 11th century A D , and it is rather unfortun
that all the sources of PK have not come to light so far The verse *anyathā* etc , giv
in Pātrakesarin's story is a pretty old verse often quoted in logical treatises, the ve
nāhaṁkāra etc from Akalanka's story is also found in one of the Śravaṇa Belgol inscr
tions[1] of 1128 A D , and the verse *pūrvam Pātaliputra* etc (quoted along with *Kāñcy*
etc.) is not only found in the above inscription but is given also at the close of Svayambh
stotra in some Mss The facts that some of these verses are in the first person and t
they stand like quotations even in PK probably indicate that Prabhācandra's details mi

[1] Epigraphia Carnatica II, No 67, verses 23 and 7.

go back to an earlier source The story No 18, which is fully reproduced by me in the Notes on No. 45, is important in various ways It is connected with gāthā No. 589 of the Bha Ā which contains a direct allusion, and has, therefore, a legitimate place in the Kathākośa, it is not found in the Kośa of Hariṣeṇa, and lastly, the story becomes intelligible only on the assumption that it had its original in Prākrit

Prabhācandra is completely silent about his sources and predecessors Chronologically HK is older than PK by more than a century A close comparison of the common stories between HK and the first part of PK shows common contents, but the elaboration and sequence of events in the story and expression indicate rather a common source than Prabhācandra's indebtedness to HK Some of the verses quoted in both the Kośas come from the same common source (HK Nos 15 16, 31 13) Prabhācandra is concerned primarily with the immediate story with its absolutely necessary details, while Harisena adds more past and future births in a verbos style and with all possible details (HK 127, PK 64, HK 139, PK 77) The stories in the second part of PK, which form a supplementary unit, give, however, a different impression All the thirtytwo stories correspond almost to a continuous section from HK, roughly Nos 13 to 56, among the stories repeated in both the parts, the one in the second or supplementary section agrees more closely with that of HK in its narrative sequence and phraseology (HK No 46 and PK Nos 19 and 90*22, etc), and lastly, at least in a few places (Notes on No 13) we can lay our finger on identical expressions These facts lead me to a tentative conclusion that Prabhācandra might have used HK, in addition to his other sources, at the time of adding these supplementary stories Thus the common stories betwen HK and PK go back to an identical source, directly or indirectly, but the stories from the supplementary section of PK do betray, in all probability, the influence of HK

(vi) On the Language of the Text

We use the designation Classical Sanskrit[1] for that phase of the language which has been standardised by Pāṇini and his followers in their grammatical treatises, and which is represented by artistic and ornate compositions so successfully attempted by eminent authors like Kālidāsa, Bāṇa and others Pāṇini's norm of correct speech is the one sanctioned by Śistas, and consequently the works of Kālidāsa, Bāna etc can be enjoyed and appreciated by intellectual aristocrats who are already trained in the niceties of language and diction Pāṇini and his immediate commentators are primarily concerned with maintaining a refined standard of language from which are eschewed all 'vulgarisms' current in the world or in ordinary life of the uninstructed populace, and naturally, therefore, the texts in classical Sanskrit have no special appeal to the uneducated masses as distinguished from the instructed classes and audiences of experts

We need not doubt that Sanskrit was a spoken language, may be in restricted sections of the society and for religious and scholastic purposes It is difficult to believe that the spoken language was of the type of, much less identical with, what we come across in

[1] Wackernagel Altindische Grammatik, vol I, pp IX-LXXIV, Macdonell A History of Sanskrit Literature, pp 22-28, Keith A History of Sanskrit Literature, pp 1-36, Chatterji The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language, Introduction, Bloch L'Indo-Aryen du Veda aux Temps Modernes, Pairs 1934, especially the Introductory portion, Chatterji Indo-Aryan and Hindi, Ahmedabad 1942, Lectures II-IV.

the works of Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti and others who must have mastered the grammar and crammed the lexicons before they developed such an elaborate sytle, with its mechanisms like Samdhi, monstrous compounds and artificial minting of meanings, where elegance and brevity were achieved by sacrificing naturalness and clearness Whenever the social circle of appeal was wider and the subject-matter was more popular and less scholastic, the degree of the standard of refinement was bound to be lowered down, and the popular speech was bound to develop solecisms, both regional and temporal, which would quietly creep into popular works Side by side with the refined phase of the language, which has come down to us in written records, there is evidence to believe that there were popular dialects current according to localities and strata of the society, and some of their elements go back to a period earlier than classical Sanskrit Mahāvīra and Buddha preferred popular dialects of Magadha for their preachings The earliest inscriptions like those of Asoka and Khāravela and coins fully bear out the fact that these dialects were the forerunners of Prākrits whose conventional usage in the dramas possibly had at its basis somewhat corresponding conditions in the society at some early period of Indian history Thus the Sanskrit texts meant for a wider circle were exposed to solecisms which might arise from both ungrammatical Sanskrit and Prākritism, the distinction between which, though subtle, is possible and needed for practical purposes The element of Prākritism, in its various aspects, becomes predominant and conspicuous when the author is steeped in the study of Prākrit works, these constituting the canonical literature of his religion, when Prākrit was his mother-tongue, or when the works were composed with Prākrit originals

All these tendencies get illustrated in the wide range of Sanskrit literature The classical authors like Kālidāsa are liable to minimal amount of solecism, and some complaints have been already made against them by later critics When we come to the epics, especially the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana, there are many forms and expressions which are un-Pāninian,[1] often betraying contamination with the speech-habits so usual in Prākrits As it may be expected in unrefined speech, delicate grammatical distinctions are not specially attended to, stray irregularities are normalised, rightly or wrongly analogical formations are set into vogue in short, the grammatical restrictions get loosened and the tendency towards simplifying the language is apparent everywhere Some of them can be defended by a liberal and hypercritical interpretation of the Sūtras of some grammatical system or other Commentators and intelligent copyists have felt offended at their presence, and a careful study of various readings indicates that constant attempts, independently carried on at different places and by different hands, have been made to normalise them [2] Purāṇas and Sanskrit texts on technical sciences present specimens of loose Sanskrit both in their vocabulary and grammatical forms The Buddhist and Jaina authors were usually well-read in their religious works in Pāli and Prākrits The measure of Prākritism in their works often depended upon individual mastery over Sanskrit grammar and expression Even an elegant stylist like Asvaghoṣa[3] is not immune from them, and works like the Lalitavistara and Mahāvastu in mixed Sanskrit (Gāthā dialect) of Northern Buddhism contain plenty of them. The Jaina authors from the South are comparatively more free from this influence, but those from the North, especially Gujarāta and Madhyadeśa,

[1] J Wackernagel Altindische Grammatik vol I, pp XLIV etc

[2] V S Sukthankar The Mahābhārata, vol I, Prolegomena, pp XCIII etc

[3] The Buddhacarita, ed by E H Johnston, Punjab University Oriental Publications, Nos 31-2, Intro pp 67-79 of the 2nd part

are more exposed to it Even eminent Sanskrit-grammarians like Hemacandra have not avoided Prākritisms If the Bower Ms, the Sanskrit digests of the Brhatkathā, and the Sanskrit texts like the Dharmaparīkṣā of Amitagati, Pariśiṣṭa-parvan of Hemacandra and Samarāditya-saṁkṣepa of Pradyumnasūri contain Prākritisms, it is mainly due to the fact that the works are based on Prākrit originals directly or indirectly Like Siddharṣi who wrote his Upamitibhavaprapañcā kathā at the beginning of the 10th century A D., some authors studiously wrote in simple and popular Sanskrit that it might be understood in a wider circle of readers Further whenever a text belongs to the class of popular epics and draws its material from Prākrit sources, it would certainly exhibit both Sanskritic solecisms as well as Prākritisms

The medieval Sanskrit texts, especially those composed by Jaina authors from Gujarāta and round about, have attracted the attention of eminent orientalists from a pretty long time, and their language has been subjected to critical study by scholars like Weber, Jacobi, Hertel, Bloomfield and others [1] The orthodox Sanskritis may shun such a study[2]; but a dispassionate linguist wants to have a fair acquaintance with the internal and external vicissitudes to which the Sanskrit language has been subjected throughout its phenomenal career, for him, there is nothing correct or incorrect, every authentic fact of the language has a judicious place in his study, and he would critically ascertain its exact position in the evolution of that language Or as Jacobi remarks 'it is considered the duty of a philologist to note such peculiarities in style, language, metrics etc, of the work he edits, as characterize its position in the Literature to which it belongs' The Kathākośa of Harisena is being printed for the first time, and it would be worth the while to study its language from this point of view Our limitations are plain the text is not quite critical, all the three Mss being of the same family, and more Mss will have to be collated to arrive at a moderately final text Some verses do present difficulties of interpretation For the present, authenticity of the text amounts to the agreement of three Mss It is not the intention of the editor to find fault with the author's language, but with all modesty he is trying to note down the salient linguistic peculiarities of the text, as it has come down to him, in the background of classical Sanskrit Grammatical standard, howsoever safe, has a limited and relative value, it cannot be avoided altogether, but it has to be supplemented with fresh facts from the various ranges of literature which alone present a historical perspective of the whole language Remembering that Harisena's text is dated and the home of its composition quite definite, the linguistic facts assume a special significance It is hoped that a student of Sanskrit and allied languages will welcome these facts for what they are worth

In addition to the orthographical peculiarities noted above (p. 3), it may be added here that sometimes *r* has a consonantal pronunciation (17. 1, 157. 73), *ś* and *s* are con-

[1] Bloomfield The Life and Stories of the Jaina Saviour Pārśvanātha Baltimore, 1919, on the language of the text pp 220-39, also Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel Gottingen 1923, Some aspects of Jaina Sanskrit, pp 220-30 Jacobi Upamitibhavaprapañcā kathā, Bibliotheca Indica ed, Preface pp. XX etc. Haragovinda and Becharadāsa Śrī-Śāntināthamahākāvya (Śrī-Yaśovijaya Jaina Granthamālā vol 20, Benares Veer-Era 2437), Prastāvanā pp 3 etc Hertel The Pañcatantra-Text of Pūrṇabhadra, HOS, 12, Pūrṇabhadra's Language pp 31-36, also his paper, 'On the Literature of the Shvetambaras of Gujarat' Leipzig 1922, especially, pp 14 f Upadhye Varāṅgacarita, Bombay 1938, Intro pp 42-48 Mul Raj Jain. Citrasenapadmāvatīcarita, Lahore 1942, Intro pp 23-30

[2] See Bloomfield's paper 'Some Aspects of Jaina Sanskrit' and the editorial remarks in the Prastāvanā of Śāntināthamahākāvya noted above

fused in words like *śmaśāna* or *smaśāna* and *ucchiṣṭa* or *utsiṣṭa* (56 235, 12 85), *y* and *j* are interchanged, and it is not unlikely, if some of them go back almost to the archetype. Hiatus is often allowed not only at the end of a pāda (10 96, 63 99, 73 23, etc) but at times also within the body of it (11 40*d*, 85 52*a* etc) There are some abnormal **Saṃdhis:** *adyameva* (12 119), *khaḍgastha* for *khadgahasta* (63 191), *śeṣatonmūlayāmi* (143 29), etc. Some words show alternative spellings Konikā, Kaunikā (61 26 f), Cānakya, Cāṇākya (143 3 f), *śramana, śravana* (74 36 f), Somilā, Ṣomillā (3 14 f), while others have fluctuating bases *kuśa, kuśikā, kuśī* (104 13 f), *ksīra, kṣīri, ksīrī* (10 71 f), *padaka, paṭuka, paddika* (121 13 f) A few words attract our attention with respect to their **genders:** *kṣiti M* (93 246), *dhvani* F (60 11), *nigraha* N (7 28), *bhūmi* M (4 33), *rakṣa* M (53 18), *vidhi* F (91 22), *samdhi* F (11 92) We meet with some of the **feminine bases** like these *jātismarī* (126 171, 127 224, also-*smarā* 126 196), *dhūrtī* (99. 60), *purahsarī* (57 55) *manoharī* (optional, 76 162, 97 3, 127 227 f), *vaitālikā* (64 70), *śrāvakī* (12 120) Then *bhavantī* (106 52) for *bhavatī* shows that the fem suffix is added to the strong base There are a few words which indicate some partiality towards **vowel-ending**· for instance, *āgasa* for *āgas* (64 48), *cetasa* for *cetas* (12 84, 70 156), *bhagava* for *bhagavat* (19 11, 46 117), *rodhasa* for *rodhas* (19 9) and *śarma* for *śarman* (105 102), of course the Sanskrit lexicons allow *śarma* and *vardhakin* (55 182) for *śarman* and *vardhaki*.

Coming to **declensions** we get *tarī* (56 137) and *srī* (57 262, 127 208) besides *śrīh* in the Noun sing , *nṛ-rājan* (157 73) and *mahā-rājan* (126 162) in the Voc sing , and *paścimasyām* (71 1, 99 53) for the usual *paścimāyām* of the Loc sing Then *asunā* (78 244) is used in sing perhaps in the sense of *ātman* and *anehāh* (98 70) in pl perhaps meaning days, also *anehas* (102 115) in the sense of time Among the pronominal forms we get *me* for *mayā* in the Inst sing (15 12, 19 63, 30 17) and *imam* for *idam* neuter Nom or Acc sing (45 29, 63 55, also 55 16) There are some conspicuous numeral formations *caturvimśat* for *caturvimśati* (105 331), *pañcāni* for *pañca* (126 150), *pañcadaśāni* for *pañcadaśa* (57 460), *dvādaśaih* for *dvādaśabhih* (praśasti 12), *dvādaśama* for *dvādaśa* (109 27), and *śataikam* for *ekaśatam* (concluding colophon)

Some of the **abstract nouns** are good examples of contamination, their formation being a compromise between two well-known forms *adarśatā* (56 410, cf *adrśyatā* and *adarśana*), *mānuṣya*, a man (73 248, cf *mānuṣa* and *manusya*), *samīpyatā* (93. 212, cf *sāmīpya* and *samīpata*), *hīlana*(97 74, cf *hīlanā* and *helana*) We have some illustrations of double abstraction *vātsalyatā* (73 294) and *vināśata* (19 30) Then *dhīra* and *dhairya* (52 15), *maṇḍalena* for *mandalatvena* (73 44) *sālasa* for *sālasya* (127 214, 153 5) and *sthira* for *sthiratva* (6 52) ar found used in this text

. The **k-suffix** plays a remarkable rôle in the language of this text It is added to nouns etc , without any notable change in the meaning, it is simply pleonastic or *svārthe k*, as the Prākrit grammarians call it *kanyakā* (65 20), *ghūkaka* (32 22), *caturthaka* (129 2), *dhātrikā* (60 168), *binduka* (102*6 6), *bhūmikā* (11 133), *mandaka* (7 68), *Mālavaka* (28 1), *vipraka* (139 103), *salākikā* (50 15), also note *ahīnakam* (74 33), *ūnaka* (139 39), *ekakam* (74 32) *kṣanamātrākam* (63 87), *vārakam* for *vāram* (71 29) Still more conspicuous is its presence in a series of pronominal forms scattered all over the text, a few typical ones may be noted here for illustration, and they are arranged in this order of the pronouns *asmad, yuṣmad, tad, etad, idam, adas* and *yad* **Nom** sing *sakah* (4 32, 10 16, 59 37), *takah*, (122 16), *sakā* (4 18, 7 64, 8 13, 12 2), *esakah* (126 80), *yakah* (56 220) —dual *takau* (57 56, 332, 126 4)—pl *take* (11 67, 78 39, 100 17), *takāh*

3. 17, 57 524), *imakāh* (136 2), *yake* (16 32, 33 140), *yakāh* (68 46) **Acc** sing: *makām* (102 74, 106 60), *takam* (4 17, 32, 6 9, 7 45, 30 23 etc.); *takām* (60 75, 68 65); *svakām* (4 6) —pl *takān* (10 21, 33 140), *imakān* (76 19), **Inst.** sing *takayā* (21. 21) —pl *imakaih* (57 149) Whitney[1], Edgerton[2] and others have discussed the different aspects of this *k*-suffix, and Edgerton has already noted how *asakau* is allowed by some grammarians and forms like *anyake, yake, sakā, takā* are found in pre-classical Sanskrit I may add here a few more references casually noted by me The Bhag Ā uses *tago* [=*takah*] for *sah* and *tagī* [=*takī*] for *sā* (gāthā Nos 508, 1058), Jinasena's Ādipurāna uses *yakā* for *yā* (23 28), and Jagannātha Pandita uses *mayakā* for *mayā* in his Citramīmāmsa khandana (p 1)[3] The suffix *l* also is found in some words *andhala* (3 3), *pangula* (85 43 f), *Yājñavalkala* (93 233), etc The possessive suffixes *vat* and *mat* are at times confused in forms like *Lakṣmīmatī* (11 62, 33 8), and the readings also are uncertain

From the following forms it would be apparent that these roots do not stick to the strict classical convention with regard to **Padas,** Parasmaipada and Ātmanepada *uttisthate* (64 16), *jalpate* (57 550), *tiṣthate* (127 172), *bhave* (12 60), *abhimantrayan* (81 51), *āprcchat* (93 300), *palāyantī* (59 86), *prārthaya* and *prārthayantyā* (12 51, 127 4), *bhīṣayan* (45 3), *marāmi* (33 90, 54 29), *mrgayan* (93 30), *vismayan* (127 221), *aśiksat* (116 38) It is interesting to note that some of them are either rare or agree with epic usages We come across a few **unsanctioned verbal forms** *nirūpa* for *nirūpaya* (57 469), *prapāya* for *prapāyaya* (62 14), *ānayisyati* for *āneṣyati* (57 301), *ghātisyati* for *ghātayisyati* (106 221), *nivrttayāmasa* for *nivartayamāsa*, also *nivrttamana* (33 27, 33 28, 81 49) There are some forms of the **Causal** with the augment -*āpaya*- *kārāpayāmi* etc , (25 7, 46 40, 54 29, 46 33, 56 409, 71 24, 32), note also *śisyāpita* (35 7), *śikṣāpana* (98 106, 102 65), *ksamāpana* (102*10 28) The form *upopapadyate* (47 144) shows double preposition, *nirmīlita* really stands for *nimīlita* (93 218), and *uttīrna* (56 313), *samuttīrya* (56 330), *uttīrya* (105 157), *uttatāra* (97 53) etc go back to the root *ava-tr* and not *ut-tr* In having the **feminine base** from the present participles, scrupulous distinction is not made between the usual weak and strong grades, so we get such forms *kurvantī* (60 48, also 94 24, 97 46, etc), *tisthatī* (106 26), *nindatī* (14 28), *rudantī* (33 19, 46 140) The form *vaksyamāna* (85 52) shows a future base in the absence of a present one The past passive participle form *musta* (126 162) is rare Among the unusual **gerund** forms, the following may be noted *nirūdhvā* (80 33), *bhunktvā*, besides *bhuktvā* (57 496, 558), *visarjya* (76 76), *vyāpayitvā* (12 128), *snāpya* (56 260-3) and *sthāpya* (93 286)

Turning to the **compounds,** the lengthening of the final vowel of the first member seen in *cakravartī-sukham*, *cakrī-kathānakam* (129 3 and colophon) and the retention of *ṛ* of the first member seen in *mātr-pitrnimittatah*, -*samāyuktaih* (11 133, 12 63) are not quite regular The collective neuter sing is not observed in some of the Samāhāra-dvandva compounds *nāsākarnau* (84 24), *mukha-bāhūru-pādebhyah* (99 9), *hastyaśva-ratha-pādātaih* (156 20) In some of the compounds of the Karmadhāraya and Bahuvrīhi types, the expected sequence of words is not maintained *nagottunge* (56 8), *apīta-soma-pūrvo'pi* (76 112), *kara-kumbhaṁ gajam* (56 258, 98 43), *jaya-nanda-krta-svānā* (85 32), *varatrāropita-skandham* (80 25), *sva-nivedita-vrttāntā* (97 70) We get *nirdoṣī* (31 34)

[1] A Sanskrit Grammar, London 1896, sections 494, 1186, 1222, etc

[2] Edgerton's discussion is confined to pre-classical Sanskrit, see The k-suffixes of Indo-Iranian, Journal of the American O S , vol XXXI, p 93f

[3] In a Ms of the Aṣṭāhnikakathā (No. 469 of 1884-86, Bhandarkar O R Institute) the form *mayakā* for *mayā* is used thrice in the Praśasti.

besides the usual *nırdoṣah* (32. 26). The following three illustrations show a strange type of compound. *rajanī-paścime yāme* (139 135), *śarvarī-paścıme yāme* (28. 43), *harıdrā-paścıme yāme* (26 4) It may be noted as a rare usuage that *bahıh* and *samam* are compounded with their nouns *Ujjayanī-bahıh* (150 36, 45), *ghūka-samam* (32 14), *Nāgavarmā-samam* (50. 11) The compound expressions *yathā-sambhavatah* (60 159) and *yathepsayā* (60 124) are not unusual in the epics. We get in this text *tūṣnī-bhavā* for *tūṣṇīṁ-bhāva* (55 136, 154, 291, 127 68)

Coming to the **Syntax,** in some sentences Acc is used for Nom. *bhagavan kān gunān tasyāh śrāvıkāyā nıvedaya* (7 18), *ācāryāh prthıvyādy-asudhārınah sajīvan ıtı bruvantı* (7.97), *kımkṛtam te'tra copasargam vadāśu me* (8 25, see also 127 172) Elsewhere too Acc is irregularly used (2 5, 4 63), and the roots *ās* and *sthā* govern Acc (8 6, 64 29, 82 25). We get some illustrations of **Instrumental of purpose.** *pravıṣto nrpasevayā* (63. 111), *nṛpam gacchatı sevayā* (66 73, also 76), *caurıkayā gatah* (59 21) Possibly Dative is used for Gen *sva-gurubhyām puro 'kṣıpat* (76 43), *ārāt* governs Gen instead of Abl (16 45), and the roots *smr* and *pra-hı* govern Gen (54 54, 56 173, 55 97) Gen is used for Dat *parıprāpteh* (55 288) and for Abl *prāṇānām apı vallabhā* (60 67), *upādhyāyasya pathatı* (27. 17).

The Imparative 2nd p sing form *dehı* is used in the sense of the Present (70 62, 105 18, 138) Many a form from the **primitive base** are used **with a causal meaning.** *apasasāra* (57 210), *uccaran* (11 132, 126 161), *dadarśa* (7 80), *pradadarśa* (108 45, but correctly at 60 below), *prakāśase* 46 153), *prajajvāla* (139 105), *pratısthıtah* (57 272), *prāpya* (124 12), *boddhavya* (27 6), *mamāra* (45 17, 52 21, 102*2 13, 109 34, 117 21, 127 272, 139 38, 148 5), *sasnau* and *sasnuh* (85 40, 134 23, 98 48, but correctly at 45 above), then some forms of the **causal base** are used **with the primitive sense:** *khādayantī* (126 46), *nindayıtvā* (59 31), *pīśayıtvā* (*peṣayıtvā*) (93 16), *pravartayāmāsa* (28 8), *yācayamānā* (119 6), *yācayıtvā* (115 10, 127 76), *yācayısye* (93 267), and for some of these we get epic parallels We get many illustrations of what may be called **Instrumental Absolute** (56 169, 73 206, 74 8, 96 66, 108 3, 139 86, 150 8) The Gen Absolute is used without any indication of 'disrespect' (56 272, 118 50). Very often Perfect participles are used as finite verb *īyıvān* (73 9, 66), *tasthıvān* (2 14, 4 29, 46 58, 50 10, 139 50, also *tasthuṣī* 54 63), *śuśruvān* (51 3) Sometimes the forms of the Potential serve the purpose of the Past *kuryuh* (9 27, 41), *prcchet* (127 188) *bhavet*, *bhavetām* (105 128, 56 49) *syāt, syātām* (97 17, 56 9, 73 28, 93 22), and note also the Benedictive for the Past *stheyāt* (56 225) Some forms of the Passive are used for the Active *hrıye* for *hare* (53 8), *hanyamānau* for *ghnantau* (76 52) We get some illustrations of *bhınna-kartrkatva* (8 40, 19 21, 70 66-7) The comparative *tarām* is separated from the finite verb (12 40) The gerund *samārūhya* is used intransitively (115 4), the root *ram* is transitive (40 3), and *sam chıd* has a cognate object (81 37)

It will be seen in the following cases that the verb agrees with the noun-predicate and not with the subject *śumśumāro mrtım prāpya jātā'jā* (73 75), *devo Manoramah Yaśodh-arābhıdhā kanyā jātā* (78 158), *Rukmını strītvam ādāya jāto dıvı suro mahān* (108 125)

The Locative Absolute is coupled with *yāvat* and *tāvat* (1 5), both of them are used in the sense of *yadı* and *tarhı* (114 31), *yāvat* denotes space and governs Acc (55 271) Often *vā* is used in the sense of *ıva* (40 13, 56, 198 93 98) At 85 56 *yadı* is perhaps used in the sense of *yad*, that The appositional numeral is of feminine gender, *catasrah*, and not of mas. or neuter as expected in view of the subject being constituted of members of different sex (106 268).

Here and there some expressions are open to the flaw of **tautology**: *atavī-vana, udyāna-vana* (49 3, 57. 502, 60 59, 105. 49), *anya-janma-bhavāntaram* (11. 32); *alpa* and *manāk* (73 42), *kasmāt* and *kim* (46 103), *vidhāya* and *kṛtvā* (105 49), *vīthī-mārgam* (76 14), *śobhanam* and *yujyate* (106 128), *sarva* and *sakala* (68 63)

At times even proper names are easily translated Śakracāpa and Indradhanuṣ (33 87 and 99) The author is in the regular habit of **dividing the members of a compound** expression, more usually proper names, by inserting words like *ādi, anta, pūrva* etc, only a few select illustrations may be noted here *anu-nagaram Giri-purvakam* (127 206), *kāṇḍādikaṁ paṭam* (8 19), *candrāntam Śrutasāgaram* (11 65), *Jina-Vasvādikau dattau* (49 4), *paryādi-vrājikā* (76 181), *pūrvottara-padāyukta-Mathurā* (12 125), *mālāntā Kanakādikā* (5 4), *Rājopapadaṁ gṛham* (9 1), *Rāja-pūrva-gṛham* (9 2), *śaraṇam samavādikam* (10 46), etc

The **lexical material** presented by this text is of great interest for the student of Sanskrit vocabulary These stories, as we have seen above, arise out of a Jaina religious text, naturally they contain so many Jaina technical terms that are freely used It is true that they are not usually recorded in ordinary Sanskrit Dictionaries with their specific shades of meaning A specialist, however, can very easily ascertain their meanings by using various Jaina texts and their commentaries In view of the linguistic purpose of the present study, Jaina technical terms are not included in the following list Besides these terms, we come across a large number of words which can be classified[1] according to some predominant tendencies represented by them First, there are many new words and formations, and also such words as are recorded in indigenous lexicons but are of rare usage in classical literature, a few are found in the Vedic language and are used here perhaps through the source of Kośas, some of them show notable variation either in their form or meaning, and as such they deserve to be taken into account Secondly, there are Back-formations Phonetically and apparently they look like Sanskrit words, but really speaking they are skilfully Sanskritised, rightly or wrongly, from well known Prākrit words used in Prākrit literature and recorded in Prākrit Dictionaries either as Prākrit or Deśī. Thirdly, there are Hyper-Sanskritisms These are also back-formations in a way, but they are given a super-Sanskritic appearance and they exist by the side of other ordinarily Sanskrit words of accepted usage Fourthly, there are Prākritisms which are straight way borrowed from Prākrit with some or without any minor changes like the addition of *ka*-suffix Lastly, there are the Vernacularisms, in view of their form or meaning They easily remind us of some words in modern Indian languages, Āryan or Dravidian, for which Prākrit or Deśī words may be or may not be detected This five-fold classification cannot be rigorous, but it holds good for all practical purposes. In recording the following facts, I have constantly used A Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Monier-Williams (New ed., Oxford 1899) and the Pāia-sadda-mahannavo by Sheth (First ed, Calcutta 1928) The following abbreviations are used below D =Deśī, noted from the Prākrit Dictionary, g =gloss, i e, the marginal gloss recorded in the foot-notes of the printed text, Pk =Prākrit, and Sk =Sanskrit.

अक्षि=*akṣi*, eye, 3 33

अक्ष, a cowrie, used as a coin, 76. 23.

[1] In view of the requirements of this text, my classification slightly differs from that proposed by Bloomfield in his paper 'Some Aspects of Jaina Sanskrit'.

अभ्यक्षम्=*samakṣam*, in the presence of, 34 3, 53 7, 71 37.
अनोकुह, a tree, 46 34, 75. 2, 76 166, 78. 110, 93 29, 108 66, 122 3, 149. 3.
अन्तर्वत्नी, g *garbhavatı*, pregnant, 86 6
अन्धल, blind, 23 17
अन्धस्, food, 8 9, 65 53
अपघन, g *śarīra*, the body, 55 287, 65 36, 73 121
अर्चा, an image, idol, 56 10, 374-5, 57 327
अर्जिका, v 1 *aryıkā* at times, Pk *ajjıyā*, a respectable lady, a nun, 46 185, 55 227, 64 86, 67 7, 70 155, 105 101, a grand-mother, 73 98
अर्यिका, usually *āryıkā* 127 283, see *arjıkā*, 46 188, 56 320, 110 5, 128 28
अवगुण्ठित, besmeared, 129 13.
अवग्रह, a religious vow, 59 20
अवधि, g *marana*, termination of life, death, 59 28
अवस्था, stipulation, *anayā'vasthaya* on this condition, 27 35, 38
अंसिका, g *dyūtakāropaveśana-sthānam*, cf Sk *aṁśa*, stake in betting, gambling hall or corner, 36 4, 5
आजवञ्जव, g *saṁsāra*, transmigratory circuit, 57 218, 76 212, 92 12 93 124, 111 15, see Tıloyapaṇṇattı II 1
आधारण, g. *hastyāroha*, D *āhorana*, an elephant-driver, 33 65
आपाक, Pk. *āvāya*, potter's kiln, 98 117-8
आराटि, usually *āratı*, D *ārādī*, crying, noise, 21 8, see *ratıta* 19 35
आर्जिका, see *arjıkā*, 56 308, 78 116
इन्द्रस्थान, a place where animals are killed, 73 64
उज्जवन, g *udyāpana*, Pk *ujjavana*, *ujjāvana*, festive conclusion of a religious or ritualistic vow or observance, 57 548, 552
उम्बरकुष्ट, a severe type of leprosy, 57 211, also *udumbara-kustha* at 57 308
उषाजल, Pk *osā-jala*, Sk *avaśyā-jala*, dew-water, 157 95 and 99
ऊरणिक, a shepherd, 74 9-10, cf Pk *ūrana*, a sheep, **उरणो पशुः** Trıvıkrama III 4 71
ऊर्णक°, Pk *ūrana*, D *ūranī*, a he-goat 73 81-2
एकसस्थ, one who grasps at a single recitation, 157 19
ओड्ड, a stone-digger, 104 26, cf Kannaḍa *oḍḍa*, one who works in the quarry
कक्ष, g *vana*, a forest, 58 13, 72 46, see also *kaccha*, pasture, 56 81
कङ्काल, poor and destitute, 146 8, cf *kamgāla* in some of our languages
कच्चार, Sk *kaccara*, D. *kaccarā* dung, refuse, dirt, 73 108, 111
कच्छ, a forest, a pasture for grazing cows, 56 81, cf *kaksa*
कच्छिक , g *mālākāra*, a florist, 56 139.
कट्टितल्ल, some armour or weapon associated with the belt, 56 298, cf Sk *katıtra*, Pk *kadılla*.
कन्दोट्ट, a lotus, 6 3, 47 6
कपर्दिक, a cowrie used as a die in gambling, 39 3, also *kapardaka*, 40. 12.

कर-पालिका, a sword, scimetar, 98 71 2, *-vālikā*, 123 7, *-vālī*, 66 92, 156. 40, *-vālam*, 11 47

कर्णिकाण्ड, a barbed arrow, 32 24, cf. Sk *karnī*, Pk *kanniya-sara*

कर्ता, a variety of cowrie used in gambling, 39 3, 40 4 f, cf D *kattā.*

कर्वट, a settlement surrounded by mountains, 33 151, 94 15-7

कर्षण, agriculture, attracting the people (?), 57 433

कलाद्, a goldsmith, jewelsmith, 105 265 f

कलिल, wicked, 47 179

कल्पपालि, read elsewhere as *kalya-*, wife of a liquor-seller, 106 145, also *kallālikā* 106 174

कल्लाल, a liquor-vendor, Vintner 31 25, also 33, cf Sk *kalya-* or *kalpa-pāla*

कल्लालिका, wife of a liquor-seller, 106 174, see *kallāla*

कहाणक, Sk *kathānaka*, Pk *kahānaga*, a talk, anecdote, 93 56

कंस, Sk *kāmsya*, bell-metal, 106 142, 144 147

कंसाल, Sk *kāmsyā-la*, *kāmsya-tāla*, a bell-metal musical intsrument, 12 139

काकुन्ती, a cry of sorrow or distress, 57 103, cf Sk *kāku*

काञ्जिका, sour gruel, 106 177, 157 41

काण्डपट, a curtain, screen, 8 19, 88 59

कार्तस्वर, gold, 102 90, 104 38

कार्पटिक, a rogue-beggar, 65 23, cf also Sk *kāpaṭika*

किङ्कल्प, a kind of bird whose presence wards off famine and brings about general welfare, 82 14 f.

कीर, a parrot, 96 27, 134 47

कीलाल, blood, 85 63, 102 82

कुट, g *ghata*, a pot, 65 55, 76 43, cf D *kuḍa*, Kannaḍa *koda*

कुटिका, g *kanyā*, a daughter, 30 8-9

कुब्जिक, hump-backed, 59 85, also cf Pk *khujjiya*

कुरुविल्ल, a crab, 105 65, cf Pk *kuru-villa*, also- *-cilla*

कुर्कुट, also *kurkkuṭa* or *-sarpa*, besides, *kukkuta*, a cock, 73 19 f, 73 175, 78 140f, 73 226 f

कुश, *kuśaka*, *kuśī* or *kuśikā*, a metal piece, 104 12, 19, 14 36 f, cf Pk *kusī*

कुहिणी, D ibid, road, 93 68

कृकवाक, besides *krkavāku*, a cock, 73 117, 178 191

केरा, g *sevā*, service, 11. 92.

कोट्ट, also *kota*, a fort, 11 68, 23 6.

कोष्ठिका, a granary, 73 136

क्रमेलक, a camel, 57 432

क्षपणक, a nude Śramaṇa or a Jaina monk, 74 39

क्षमण, offering apology, 60 123

क्षमापण, offering apology, 60. 131, 61. 56, cf. Pk. *khamāvaṇā.*

क्षुल्लिका, a nun of the Ksullaka rank, 108 27-8, cf Sk *ksudra-ka.*

क्षेमं दा, to embrace, 55 163, etc

खटिका, g *sadıtā*, wasted away, dried up, 81 84

खजक, name of a particular food, 7 75, Pk *khajjaga*

खटिका, chalk, 57 452

खटा, Pk *khaddā*, Sk *gartā*, a hollow, ditch, 45 19, see *khaddā*

खड्डा, D ibid, Sk *gartā*, a hollow, ditch, 45 18, see *khatvā* and *garta* in verses 19 and 25

खल्वाटकी, (qualifying *dālıh*), bald, husked, 24 37

खल्लि, D *khallī*, bald head, 76 233

खातिका, a ditch or moat, 81 42, 46

खारी, a measure of grain, 7 76

खुण्ट, a broken trunk of a tree or plant, a peg, 3 26

खेट, one who moves in the air, a Vidyādhara, 7 22, etc

गणेत्री, D *ganettiyā*, a rosary, 96 44, 70, 99 33, cf Sk *ganayıtrıkā*

गण्डक-गण्डिका, a piece of sugar-cane, 93 55, cf Pk *ganda* and *gandıyā*

गड्डिकालम्बिका, 55 162, cf Pk *gaddıā*, a cart, *gaddarıyā*, a goat, see Notes at the end

गमागम, going and coming, 55 217, usually *gatāgata*

गहिल्लक, Pk *gahılla*, one possessed by a demon, 17 10, 55 44 f, *grhıllā* at 17 7, cf Sk *grahıla*

गवाशन, g *mleñcha*, *bhılla*, a man of an outcast race, 33 34, 37

गिरिद्दा (?) 102*9 8

गिलित, swallowed, 28 29, cf Sk *gırıta* also

गुण्डिका, a scroll (?), 9 28

गै, to speak, 10 105, etc

गोणतक, also *gaunatvaka*, v 1 *gonatvaka*, D *gonattaya*, a bag, sack, see also *gonıkā*

गोणिका, a bag, sack, 11 17, 79, see *gonataka*, cf Sk *gonī*

गोणिका, D *gonī*, a cow, 57 214

गोदण्ड, Pk *goanta*, the print of a cow's hoof, 69 29, here perhaps the mark of the wooden rod tied to cow's neck, cf Sk *gokantaka*

ग्रामकूट, D *gāmauda*, *gāmaūda*, the village headman, 71 3, 79 7, 86 7, 135 7, 12, in a corresponding context the Kannada Vaddāradhane uses *gāvumda*, present-day Kannada *gauda*, *gaumḍa*

ग्राह, also *āgraha*, obstinacy, 10 71, 73

घारिका, Pk *ghārıyā*, a kind of food-preparation, 7 75, cf Sk *ghārtıka*, pulse ground and fried with clarified butter

घृत-पूर,-*pūraka* or *pūrıka*, a sweet-meat, 7 75, 24 27, 56 228

चट्ट, D ibid, a pupil, 114 25-6

चतुर्थ, Pk *cauttha*, one day's fast, when in all four meals are cancelled, 57. 224.

चन्द्रकवेध, a kind of target (described in the text), 43 6, 57 376, 58 25.

चमूर, a tiger, 92 8, perhaps identical with *camara*, a wild ox or yak, 93 182; cf also Sk *camūrū*

चाण्डकार, D *caṇḍāra*, a store-house 157 42, **caṇḍāgāra* may be postulated, cf. *krodhāgāra* Rāmāyana II 10 8, 21, *kopagṛha*, anger-chamber, swearing-room, Pārśvanātha-caritra of Bhāvadeva, 7 42

चातुरङ्ग=*caturanga*, Pk *cāuranga*, 24 5, 57 414, etc.

चिपिट, Pk *cimidha*, flat (nose etc), 106 247

चिरचीरिका, the hem of garment 83 28

चिलातक, P *cilāa*, Sk *kirāta*, one belonging to the Kirāta tribe, 58 26

चीरकभक्त, 129 43

चुल्लिका, a fire-place, 102 11

चोरण: a thief, 33 93

चोलिका, a cradle-like mechanism of thick garment, 131 30, cf Pk *collaya* and *jhollıyā*

चोल्लक, a specific dish, 35 34-5

छज्जिका, v l *chajjikā*, *chajjakā*, *vajjikā*, D *chajjiyā*, a basket, 15 6, 10, 13-4, in the corresponding context Prabhācandra reads *chatrikā*

छिद्रा, *adj*, pierced, 11 123

छुरिका, Pk *churigā*, Sk *kṣurikā*, a knife, 4 24

छेलक, a he-goat, *chelikā*, a she-goat, 71 15, 76 45 f, 93 148, 73 78-81, cf Sk *chagala*, D *chela*

जरन्त, a buffalo or *mahiṣa*, 73 83, 85, 92, 104, 93 140-1, 121 21

जरी, or *jarin*, g *vrddha-puruṣah*, an old man, 116 9

जलूका, a blood-sucking leech, 102 87

जाप, muttering prayers, 19 5

जाहक, a chameleon (?), 73 41-43

जीवन, maintenance, livelihood, 102*3 4

जोष, also *yosa*, silence, 76 29, 60, 82, 102 95

टक्क, also *takkaka*, a niggard, perhaps a professional name like *thakka*, 63 91 f

टक्कार, also *takkāra*, beating, 14 26, 32

टोल्लक, also *ḍhollaka*, an instrument for beating, 14 32

डम्भ, deceit, 76 26.

डिण्डुक, also *dinduka*, a water-snake, 102*8 7, 18, cf Pk *dunduha*, Sk *dindibha*, *dunduka* and *dundubha*

डुम्ब, also *domba*, a man of low caste, 19 17, 27 16, 48.

ढोल्लक, see *ṭollaka*

तमीमुख, beginning of night, 47 10

तरण्ड, a boat, 145 45

तलवर्ग, D *talavara*, *talāra*, Sk. *talavara*, a city-guard, 56 264, 63. 147, 81 57, see *talāra*.

तळार-क, D *talāra*, a city-guard, 35 20, 22, 46 127, 57 174, 59 11, 63 23, etc, see *talavarga*

ताम्रचूल, a cock, 73 120

तारकम्, a star, 57 381

तुम्बक, the *tumba* gourd, 93 100

तुपुडिका, 126 227

तोक, g *putra*, a son, child, 50 7, 55 107, 63 152, 138 41, also *stoka*, 76 85, 145 19

तोणीर, Pk ibid, a quiver, 56 297, cf Sk *tūnīra*

द्रवड्ड, D ibid, a village-headman, but here perhaps a palace, 98 46, 101

दर्दुर, 61 52

दारिद्र, poverty, 63 91

दीनार, a gold coin denarius, 143 42

दुन्दुभि, g *visa*, serpent's poison, 27 33

देवप्रिय, dear to the gods, a term of address, 73 133, cf Pk *devānuppiya, devānām api vallabhah*, perhaps in the sense of a fool, 25 24

देवर, a husband, a husband's brother 150 159

देशिक, a traveller, 33 48, 40 5, 72 44, 85 44

दोतटी, Pk *dottadī*, a dangerous river, 19 32

दोहल, pregnancy longing, 56 153, also *dauhrda*, 106 104, more correctly *daurhrda*, cf Pk *dohala*, Sk *dohada*

द्रम, a drachma, 104 26, cf Sk *dramma*

द्विफण, (**dviphana*), a double-hooded (serpent?), 73 48

धाटक, driving out, 11 100

धाटित, *nir-dhātita* etc, cf the Pk root *dhāda*, to drive out, 55 111, 56 212, 11 56, 25 26, etc

धार, [=*dhārā*], succession, series, 155 12

धीरिन्, so *dhīra*=*dhairya*, Pk *dhīra*,, 52 15

धूमरी, D ibid, fog, dusk, darkness, 96 65-6, cf Sk *dhūmra*

नखा, g *mudrikā*, also *nakha*, a seal-ring, 63 32, 41

नराधम, a Mātanga, 72 45

नागिनी, Pk *nāinī*, a female cobra, 27 11, 55 266, 56 107, cf Sk *nāgī*

नाहल, v l *nāhara*, an outcast tribe, 54 32, 56 354

निषङ्ग, a leather bag, 73 147

नीरसङ्घ, a mass or quantity of water, 102 130

पञ्चकूर्च, hair growing on the five parts of the body, 96 44, 99 34

पञ्चबिल्व, five kinds of Bilva used for disgracing a culprit, 11 139, 23 31, 24 38, 82 40

पञ्चुम्बर, Pk ibid, Sk *pañcodumbara* 66 70

पड्डुक, v l *padaka, panduka, patuka*, D *paḍḍaya, paḍḍiā*, a calf, 121 13, 15, 17, 19 f.

पम्पा, g *tṛṣā*, Pk *pampā*, thirst, 5 8, 35 11, 55 31, 69 29 85 8, etc, cf Bhaga Ārādhanā, 1145, 1166, the commentaries render it by *āśā*
पट्ट=*paṭa*, 55 197, 108 48
पल्लि, *pallī*, *pallikā*, a settlement of wild tribes, a village, 55 9, 33 25, 58 8, 11.
पशव, *paśavī*, D *pasaya*, a kind of animal, 73 41
पाङ्गुरण, Pk *pamgurāna*, covering, 127 216
पाण, an outcast, a Cāndāla or Domba, 19 28-9, 27 17, 74 47
पाण्डुरीक, also *-panduri*, a variety of serpents, 66 60, 62
पादोगमन, also *pādopagamana*, a kind of fasting and death, 126 236, 128 16, cf Sk *prāyopagamana*, *pādapopagamana*
पारसीक, the Persian, 102 80 f
पार्श्वलय, adjoining, lying near, 73 111
पिट्टारक, a casket, 55 284, cf Sk *piṭaka* and *pithara*
पिण्डार, a buffalo-herdsman, 121 48
पिप्पल=*pippala*, 63 220
पुण्डरीक, a tiger, 92 3, 102*3 7, 157 80
पुलिन्द्र=*pulinda*, 76 95, 97
पुष्कल=*puskara*, 54 56, but *puskara* at 54 35
पूत्कार=*phūtkāra*, 64 68, 99 63
पूपपत्रिका, a thin wheat-bread, 7 75
पूर, a food-preparation, 7 75, 56 228
पूरिकः, also *pūraka*, an article of food, 7 75, 56 228
पूषक, D *pūsa*, a parrot, 33 34, 39, 134 46
पेट, *petaka*, a multitude, a party (of dancers), 73 52, 55, 98 9
प्रजन, g *vivāha*, marriage, 65 18, 22
प्रयातना, g *pratimā*, also *pratiyātanā*, *yātanā*, an image, idol, 20 19, 78 253, 56. 16, 51, 57 329 f
प्रधि, a well, 93 92
प्राघूर्णक, a guest, 12 8, 28 33, 32 13
प्राणहिता, a shoe, 55 66, 68 41, 45, cf Pk *pānahā*, Sk *upānah*
प्राशुक=*prāsuka*, Pk *phāsuga*, free from living beings, 7 95
प्रेक्षण=*prenkhana*, a net, 9 15
फर, also *pharaka*, *pharakā*, a shield, 93 16, 18, 56 298, 123 9, cf D *phara*, *pharaa*
बान्धव, a brother, 117 12
बुन्दी, D *bomdi*, body, 57 584
बोधिस्थ, D *bohittha*, a boat, 53 4, 82 25, 93 72 f, 105. 38, see *bohittha*
बोहित्थ, a boat, 78 42 f, see *bodhistha*
भक्ष्, to bite, 65 74, 86.
भगव=*bhagavat*, 19 11, 49, 46 117, 55 234

भण्डक, also *bhāndaka*, a pot, 63 191, 193, 98. 20.

भण्ड=*bhānda-śālā*, a store-house, 77 99, cf *bhaṇḍāgāra*, 105 300

भण्डन, war, 56. 307, 309.

भदन्त, a term of respect used in addressing a monk, 59 13, cf Pk. *bhamte*; Sk. *bhadram te*

भल्ली, a spear, a kind of arrow, 116 19.

भस्त्रः, a leather bag, 73 149, also *bhastrā*, *bhastrikā*, 93 159-60.

भाक्तिक., a devotee, 9 25

भाण्डार, Pk *bhamdāra*, a store-house, a treasure-house, 63 30, cf *bhāṇḍāra-śālā*, 102*9 6

भीलु-क, g *bhīru*, timid, afraid of, 57 218

मकुट=*mukuṭa*, crown, 105 266

मठिका, Pk *madhī*, monastery, 52 11

मण्डका, an article of food, 7 75, 140 18

मण्डल, a dog, 34 19, 55 297, 57 168, 58 13 f, 73 44, etc

मत्सी, a fish, 96, 40-1

मर्षिक=*amarṣika*, indignant, 123 5

मषि, g *mudgadālih*, *mudga* beans, 24 16, 37

महत्तर, a chief officer, minister, 56 265, 82 35

महत्तरिका, an elderly woman, 73 53

महिमा, *f* a festivity, 63 9

माण्डूक=*mandūka*, a frog, 147 6, also *mandūka* at 8 below

मात्सलिका, a fish, 106 78

मात्सिक, a fisherman, a fish, 106 37, 71 f

माम, maternal uncle, 105 167, 169

माहन, a Brāhmana, 11 127, 55 112, 56 241, 60 37 (v 1 *brāhmana*), cf Pk *māhana*, and *māhānaka* at 134 14

मिण्ढक, also *mendhraka*, *mendhaka*, v 1 *meḍhaka*, a ram, 74 9-10, 126 106, 110, 127 136, cf Sk *medhra*, Pk *mimdhaya*

मूशल, also *muśala*, a pestle, 117 20-1

मैथुनिक, v 1 *maithunaka*, brother-in-law, 12 38, 47 8, 97 25, cf Pk. *mehuṇaya*, *mehuniya*

यव, speed, 56 383, cf Sk *java*

यातना, g *pratimā*, an image, idol, 56 14

यूथ, a multitude a party (of men), 110 21

योष, see *josa*.

रक्ताक्ष, red-eyed, a serpent, 92 10

रच्य, Pk **रच्छ**, Sk **रक्ष्य**, that which is to be protected, 56 411

राशि, a group, multitude, 12 67, 13 6

राष्ट्रकूट, also *rāṣṭroda*, chief of a dominion, district, country, 126. 95, 97, 124, cf. *grāmakūta* also.

रासक, a kind of dance, 57 103
रिक्ष, Pk riccha, Sk ṛkṣa, a bear, 157 72 f
रोहक or ārohaka, g hastipaka, an elephant-driver, 57 424
लकुट, a club, 62 32, 36, 63 218, cf Pk lauḍa
लङ्ख, also lankhika, v. l. laṅkhaka, a pole-dancer, 126 42, 80. 18, 23, cf. Pk. lamkha, lamkhaga
लड्डुकः, Pk ladduga a kind of sweet-meat, 21 15, 35 15, 72. 97.
लम्पिक्षुः or lampikṣuh, D lampikkha, a thief, 102*2 9, 138 30, 46
लम्बूष, D lambūsa, an ornamental or decorative pendant, 57 534
लय, lying near, see pārśva-laya adjoining, 73 111
लाङ्गुल=lāngala, 139 93
लीहा, a line, 134 44, 45
लोष्टु, a clod, 105 71.
वट्ट, also vattaka, D vatta, a cup, 55 71, 116 43, 131. 7, 11
वट्टलक, D vaṭṭa, an article of food, 21 13, 24
वयंसक, Pk vayamsa, Sk vayasya, a contemporary, an associate, friend, 12 42
वरत्रा, also varatrikā, a strap, rope, 80 21, 33, 93 110
वार्तिक, a rope-dancer, 80 37, see also varatrā, 80 37
वरवल्ल, 56 261, it is perhaps a wrong reading, see daravalla
वर्कर, 135 9
वर्मल, also varmalya, g maulya, price, cost, 28 33, 40 8
वल्लकी, g vīnā, a kind of lute, 33 53
वल्लर, also vallaraka, D ibid , forest, thicket, 139 116-17, 120
वसर , a tiger, 139 63
वसुधान्तरम् , under-ground, 102 30
वातारि, the castor-oil plant, 63 134, 137
वारिक, selected, 55 121
वास्य, Pk vāsa, Sk varṣa (as in Bhārata-varṣa), a division of earth, 6 1, etc
वाह्याली, a ground for training horses etc , 127 52
विकुर्वणा, a magical transformation 7 84
विट्टाल, pollution, 157 37
विट्टालित, D. vittāla, polluted, 105 134.
विण्टण, Pk vimtana, Sk veṣṭana, a wrapper, a roll, 139 103, also see vemta 139 104.
वित्त, g jñānavanta, learned, celebrated 78 217
विन्ध, Pk ibid , to pierce, 116. 10
विमान, a bier, 57. 207
विलम्बित्व delay, 14 11.
विशिख, a passage, perhaps also a shop, 55 204, 102*9. 13
विहाय=पिधाय, 108 9.
वीवाह, marriage, 150. 18, 46

वेवघ, a net, 72 14, 149 4

व्रजन, g *vivāha*, marriage, 55 229, cf *prajana* for which this may be a wrong reading

शमिला, Pk *samilā*, Sk. *śamyā*, the pin of a yoke, 44 18

शयु, the boa snake, 78 170

शिबलि, a kind of tree, its wood being used in preparing a *bherī*, 120*7 3, 8.

शिरा, a vein like channel, 56 380

शुंशुमार, Pk *sumsumāra*, an alligator, 73 50, 60, 74 39

शोकवर्तिनी, some article of food, 7 75, 56 228

शौण्ड , g *kalālah*, a liquor-vendor, 31 2

श्रवण=*śramana*, 74 36

श्रावित, Pk *sāvia*, Sk *śāpita* (?), 28 22, 65 83, 107 13-4

श्रोत्रिक:, Pk *sottia*, Sk *śrotriyah*, learned in the Veda, 80 2

समावर्धापन, birth-day (?), 57 571

सर्जित, Pk *chajjiya*, *sajjiya*, Sk *sajjita*, dressed, made ready, 56 158

सरथा, recitation, instruction, 76 6, 157 21

साणूर, D ibid , a temple, but g *kūpa*, 19 51, 71 7, 98 19, 120 7, 138 13, also *sālūra* 80 71

साण्बर, see *sānūra*, 99 6

साधनिक, one who practises *sādhana*, 126 116

सालनक, Pk *sālanaya*, an article of food, 19 56

सालूर, 80 71, see *sānūra*

सिक्कक, Pk *sikkaga*, Sk *śikyaka*, 4 23, 93. 99

सुरङ्गा, a subterranian passage, 33 46

सूत्रकण्ठ, a Brāhmana, 66 5, 73 98, 93 308

सौल. (Sk *saurah*), a distiller or seller of liquor, 106 166

सौलिका, g *kāmvalī*, a crow, 102*6 5, 139, 53-4, 140 33-4

स्तभ, also neuter, a goat or ram, 73 76, 76 50

स्तोक, see *toka* above

स्थूरीपृष्ठ, g *hastiprstha*, 56 329, g *mahiṣī* 57 204, horse 70 54, 69, 108 77

हट्ट, market, 28 48, 72 89

हठकार, force, 106 60.

हरिद्रा, night, 26 4, 70 148

हार, a crocodile, 73 51, 54, 57

हीलन, the act of slighting, 127 63, 67

This grammatical discussion shows that Harisena's language fairly agrees with what we call epic Sanskrit in some details[1], namely, treatment of the feminine forms of the present participle in *atī* or *antī*, confusion between Parasmaipada and Ātmanepada, interchange of the causal and primitive bases and meanings of roots, indiscriminate formation

[1] Wackernagel Altindische Grammatik, pp XLIV f

of the two gerunds in *tvā* and *ya*, and irregular uses of cases Some of the words, their genders and meanings have a close resemblance with the usages recorded from the epics Most of the remaining traits of the language either show Prākritic influence or are specimens of loose handling of grammatical standard If an author writes in Sanskrit but has some Prākrit dialect as his mother-tongue (or the language spoken in daily routine), it is inevitable that his Sanskrit composition would show Prākrit tendencies now and then With regard to certain irregular forms, the future studies of similar works alone would decide whether they represent any grammatical tradition or they are author's irregularities and scribal slips in some cases

The term Jaina Sanskrit has been already made current by Bloomfield[1], but the limits of its connotation should not be ignored It is apparently used on the analogy of Buddhist Sanskrit, but there is some imporant reservation 'Not the least bit like the relation of Buddhist Skt to Pāli tradition is the relation of Jaina Skt to the Ārsa or Ardhamāgadhī of their canon (Siddhānta) Buddhist Skt is largely a Sanskritized Pāli, Jaina Skt is rooted in the main in Classical Skt literature, and, to an astonishing extent, in the lexical and grammatical traditions of Classical Skt speech' According to the considered opinion of Bloomfield, 'The Sanskrit Lexicon of the future will have much business with Jaina Sanskrit' Secondly, besides showing Prākrit influence and 'occasional Hyper-Sanskritism, i e, it changes good Skt words which have a Prākritic fonism into seemingly better Skt', its 'diction is not altogether proof against local dialects' Thirdly, it must be remembered that almost all the texts, which form the basis for Bloomfield's study, come from Gujarāta and round about and belong to 11th and subsequent centuries Lastly, eminent Jaina authors from the South, such as Samantabhadra, Pūjyapāda, Vādirāja etc, have successfully handled the Sanskrit language almost in its classical purity So whenever we use the term Jaina Sanskrit, we must bear its scope in mind, in fact, its traits are practically covered by epic peculiarities with the addition of Prākritism in its different aspects

As noted above[2], there is ample circumstantial evidence to demonstrate the possibility that the stories of this Kathākośa might have been originally included in a commentary on the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā, secondly, Āśādhara explicitly remarks that the ten illustrative tales corresponding to Harisena's stories, Nos 35-44, were present in the Prākrit commentary etc, and lastly, the explanation of ***krmirāga-kambala*** given by Harisena and Āśādhara goes back possibly to a common Prākrit source These considerations make it more than probable that this Kathākośa is based on some Prākrit commentary on the Bha Ā. Though the conclusion is already anticipated, it is necessary here to put together various linguistic traits which confirm the possibility of the Prākrit source for these tales and the presence of which cannot be otherwise justified

This Kathākośa is a Sanskrit text, most of the names in these stories are a matter of author's selection, so if the author uses some un-Sanskritic names, it is reasonable to admit that the author's selection was influenced by the sources used by him[3]. (*i*) A glance at the Index shows that there are many proper names which, at times with very slight changes, are justified only in a Prākrit text Ayalā, Usabha-dāsa, -dāsī, Kasamvalaka,

[1] See Some Aspects of Jaina Sanskrit in the Festschrift Wackernagel, pp 220 f

[2] See pp 38, 58, 67, etc

[3] The Sanskrit digests of the Bṛhatkathā do show Prākritisms in their language Budhasvāmin Sanskritises Prākrit terms here and there (Keith A History of Sanskrit Literature, p 274) The proper name Madanamañcukā, I think, stands for Sk Madanamañjūṣā

Kuruvilla, Gudakhedaka, Jānakasimgala, Duranda, Bambhillaganinī, Maddillapattanā, Medajja, Vānārasī etc., secondly, some names show alternative forms, both of which are possible from one and the same Prākrit form that can be easily conjectured in most of the cases Kurujangala and Kurujāngala (Pk Kurujamgala), Konikā and Kaunikā (Pk Koṇiyā), Ksāntikā and Kṣāndikā, Ksāntikā and Khyāntikā (Pk Khamtiyā), Khatakhaṭa and Khaḍakhada (Pk Khaḍakhaḍa), Dravida and Dravila (Pk Davila), Vinyātata and Venyātaṭa (Pk Vennāyada), Sopāraka and Sopāraya, etc., some of them being found in the same story and having identical reference Candaprajñah and Caṇdapradyotah (Pk. Camḍapajjoo?), Cāṇakya and Cānākya (Pk Cānakka), Mundikā and Munditā (Pk Mumdiyā), Medajja and Medajña (Pk Meajja), Vidyuddrdha and Vidyuddamstra (Pk Vijjudāḍha), Satyaki and Sātyaki (Pk Saccaī), lastly, there are some names which show unsatisfactory Sanskritisation or are hyper-sanskritic Cilāta (Pk Cilāya, Sk Kirāta), Tāmalipti (Pk Tāmalitti, Sk Tāmralipti), Daśānya (Pk Dasanna, Sk Daśārna), Dhānyakumāra (Pk Dhanna-, Sk Dhanya-), Nagnaki (Pk Naggai, Sk Nāgnyajit), Nāmavādī (Pk Nammavāī, Sk Narmavādin), Pispalāda) Pk Pippalāya, Sk Pippalāda,) Bhārate vāsye (Pk Bhārahe vāse, Sk Bhāratavarse or Bhārate varse), Yamadagni (Pk Jamadaggi, Sk Jamadagni)- Vijñātata (Pk Vennāyada, Sk Venātata), Vairakumāra (Pk Vaira-, Sk Vajra-), etc (*ii*) It is seen above[1] how the same name has been differently Sanskritised by Harisena and the Kannada Vaddārādhane The Kannada author keeps a Prākrit verbal form *bolaha* (Imp 2nd p pl from *vola*, to go) and in the corresponding passage Harisena uses *gaccha* (131 30) such relics do indicate a common Prākrit source (*iii*) Among the grammatical details, Samdhis like *adyameva*, alternative spellings like *padaka*, *patuka* and *padḍaka*, partiality towards vowel bases of nouns which ordinarily have consonant-endings, the pronominal forms like *me* for *mayā* and *imam* for *idam*, the causal with the augment-*āpaya*-, the meaning attached to *uttr*, the usage of Instrumental of purpose, etc are abnormal in Classical Sanskrit, but all of them get easily and rightly explained, if we take into account the rules of Prākrit grammar and Prākrit usages Though the topic requires more thorough study, I feel inclined to suggest that even the excessive use of *ka*-suffix may get partly explained in the light of Prākrit tendency seen in such cases as *aham*, which, with the *ka*-suffix, presents itself under various garbs in Prākrit *ahaam*, *ahayam*, *hage*, *hake*, *ahake*, *hakam haū* All these have led to a postulate like, **ahakah*, besides the well-known *ahakam* This *ka*-suffix does play a conspicuous part in Prākrits[2] (*iv*) Turning to the vocabulary, back-formations may be found in works which are not necessarily based on a Prākrit original The abnormal use of Prākritisms, with or without minor changes, seen from the list of words studied above, deserves our special attention Not only that, but looking at words like *arjikā*, *karapālikā*, *khaddā*, *gahillaka*, *gonattaka*, *charjikā*, *joṣa*, *talavarga*, *paddika*, *pādogamana*, *puskala*, *bodhistha*, *mindhaka*, *rāstrakūṭa* etc., we actually get also the evidence to the effect that the author is easily trying to Sanskritise certain Prākrit words, and the results of his attempts in different contexts have been varied For the present, it is futile to question the evidence supplied by all the three Mss, almost unanimously (*v*) Lastly, words like *uṣājala*, *bhīluka*, *rathya*, *vihāya*, *śrāvitah*, *saula* etc., become meaningless in those contexts unless they are interpreted in the light of their Prākrit counterparts which might have been there before the author

All the facts, noted above, cannot be explained merely by saying that the author was well-versed in Prākrits or the copyists are responsible for Prākritisms. We should not

[1] See p 67
[2] Pischel Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen, sections 142, 194, 417, 426 and 598

take these facts and items individually and try to explain them away, but look at the cumulative value of the entire mass of evidence in its proper perspective Thus the Prākrit elements, so explicit and frequent in the language of these stories, and the linguistic evidence available from the comparative study of Hariṣeṇa's Kathākośa and the Kannaḍa Vaḍḍārādhane almost definitely prove the possibility of a Prākrit original for Hariṣeṇa's work, and further, the valuable remark of Āśādhara indicating that some similar stories were present in the Prākrit commentary etc, makes it highly probable that the stories of Hariṣeṇa might have been based on a Prākrit commentary on the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā of Śivārya

(vii) Orientalists on the Jaina Narrative Literature

We have studied the different aspects of this Kathākośa of Hariṣeṇa which occupies an important place in Jaina narrative literaure, the various currents of which are casually reviewed above The orientalists began the study of Jaina literature rather late, still many eminent scholars have worked on important narrative texts that have afforded new material to enrich different branches of Indological study Some have already emphasised its study in understanding Indian life and literature, as well as the salient traits of Indian culture Some of their remarks are valuable not only as an estimate of Jaina narrative literature but also as constructive suggestions for the guidance of future workers in the field Critical studies in different branches of Jaina literature are still in their infancy, though the richness of the field was already anticipated by Buhler in his significant remark made years ago [1] The Jaina writers 'have accomplished so much of importance, in grammar, in astronomy, as well as in some branches of letters, that they have won respect even from their enemies, and some of their works are still of importance to European science In southern India, where they worked among the Dravidian tribes, they also advanced the development of these languages The Kanarese literary language and the Tamil and Telugu rest on the foundations laid by the Jaina monks This activity led them, indeed, far from their proper goal, but it created for them an important position in the history of literature and culture' If the workers follow critical and comparative lines of study, the results of their research will enviably enrich the fields of Indological study With respect to Jaina narrative literature, Winternitz remarks[2] 'Like the Buddhist monks, the Jaina monks, too, delighted at all times in adorning their sermons with the telling of stories, in converting worldly stories into legends of saints, in elucidating Jinistic doctrines by means of 'examples', thus exploiting the inborn Indian love for fables in order to win over and retain as many adherents as possible for their religion' 'As in the case with the Buddhist Jātakas, this narrative literature imbedded in the Commentaries, contains many popular themes, including some which occur also in other Indian and non-Indian literatures, and form part of the common treasury of universal literature' We have already studied his views on ascetic poetry which, he further adds[3], 'likes to take its subjects from popular tales, fairy stories, fables and parables Now the Jainas have always had a special liking for any kind of popular poetry, especially folk-tales Jaina literature, both canonical and still more non-canonical, is a very store-house of popular stories, fairy tales and all kinds of narrative poetry' About the extent and the reality of tone, he says 'The mass of

[1] On the Indian Sect of the Jainas, London 1903, p 22
[2] A History of Indian Literature, vol II, pp 484, 545 etc
[3] Indian Culture, vol I, 2, p 147

narratives and books of narratives among the Jainas is indeed vast They are of great importance not only to the student of comparative fairy-tale lore, but also because, to a greater degree than other branches of literature, they allow us to catch a glimpse of the real life of the common people Just as in the language of these narrative works there are frequent points of agreement with vernaculars of the people, their subject-matter, too, gives a picture of the real life of the most varied classes of the people, not only the kings and priests, in a way which no other Indian literary works, especially the Brahman ones, do'

Dr Hertel[1], whose studies on the Pañcatantra are quite well-known, has worked on a number of medieval Jaina narrative texts In his opinion, 'the narrative literature of the Jainas is connected with several problems' the chief of which are first, 'the problem of the migration of stories' which 'belongs to the domain of literary history and of history of civilization Its solution is of equal importance for India and for the rest of the world', and the second, 'purely linguistic' one, whose solution 'cannot but produce results which will prove to be of fundamental importance not only for the history of Sanskrit and other Indian languages, but for the history of Indian literature as well' He has sufficiently elaborated both these problems, and some of his remarks on the study of the linguistic aspect of these texts are highly critical and thought-provoking He has in view especially the narrative works in Sanskrit written by Śvetāmbara authors of medieval and post-medieval Gujarat, but on the whole, his remarks are equally applicable to other Jaina narrative works and deserve careful study It is already noted above how the Karman doctrine forms the back-bone of many of the tales, and with reference to that Hertel remarks 'Nobody will deny the wholesome influence which the doctrine of *karman* must necessarily exercise on the faithful members of the Jain community with regard to their behaviour, not only towards their fellow-men, but towards all their fellow creatures Animal life is as sacred to a Jain as human life' He fully brings out some of the salient traits of the Jaina didactic narrative texts in his following observations

'In these books (i e , Aupadeśika texts) as well as in the commentaries on the Siddhānta, the Jains possess an extremely valuable narrative literature which includes stories of every kind romances, novels, parables and beast fables, legends, and fairy tales, and funny stories of every description The Śvetāmbar monks used these stories as the most effective means of spreading their doctrines amongst their countrymen, and developed a real art of narration in all the above mentioned languages (namely, Sanskrit, Prākrit, Apabhraṁśa, Hindī, Gujarātī, and Rājasthānī dialects), in prose and verse, in *kāvya* as well as in the plainest style of everyday life Beside single stories, they have compositions, in which a great many tales are embedded in frame-stories, as in the Pañchatantra, and collections of single stories resembling the collection of the Household Tales of the brothers Grimm

'At the beginning of his homily, a preaching Jain monk usually gives, in a few prose words or verses, the topic of his sermon (Dharmadeśanā), and then goes on to tell an interesting tale of more or less considerable extent, with many romantic incidents, and in most cases with several intercalated stories Towards the end of his story, he introduces a *kevalin*, i e , an omniscient Jain monk, who comes to a grove belonging to the town in which the persons of his story are dwelling at its end After hearing the sermon of this monk, these persons ask him, why all the vicissitudes, which they had to pass through

[1] On the Literature of the Śvetāmbaras of Gujarat Leipzig 1922, pp 11 f , 3, 6 f

during their adventures, fell to their lot The Kevalin, then, explains to them all the happy as well as the unhappy incidents by relating the story of their previous existence.

'The literary form of these Jain sermons resembles that of the Buddhist Jātaka, but it is highly superior to it A Jātaka begins with a story which, in most cases, is quite insignificant Such and such a thing has occurred to such and such a monk The Buddha arrives The other monks question him about the present case, and the Buddha explains it by narrating the story of the respective monk's previous existence This story of the past is the main story of the Jātaka (whereas in the Jain sermons it forms only the conclusion), the Bodhisatta, or future Buddha, himself plays a rôle in it, and this rôle, of course, must be worthy of him, the whole story, moreover, must be an edifying one The Jātakas, as far as they are interesting, are no inventions of the Bauddhas, they are taken from the huge store of tales spread all over India Most of these popular tales are ingenious, or funny, or interesting in some other respect, but they are not edifying Hence the Bauddha monks, whose Jātakas *must* be edifying and *must* contain a rôle worthy of the Bodhisatta, are forced to alter the popular stories they use for these purposes, and the lamentable consequence generally is that such a Jātaka becomes a rather dull story, from which all the wit of its original has disappeared, and its development is often contrary to all psychological probability The Bauddhas impart their doctrines directly, showing, by the Bodhisatta's example, how a creature should act in accordance with the Bauddha notions of morals, and if the popular story chosen for being transformed into a Jātaka does not contain such a moral action, this story must be altered accordingly. To a Bauddha, the study of arthaśāstra, or political science, is a sin Now many of the best Indian stories have been developed in this śāstra The Bauddha monks take over into their collections of stories a great many of such *nīti*-tales, but in accordance with their principle, they are compelled to alter the very points, and consequently even the most essential features, of these stories, and by doing so, they inevitably must destroy the stories themselves'[1] It is not a mere chance that amongst the innumerable recensions of the Pañchatantra there is not even one of Bauddha origin, whereas the Jaina recensions, called Pañchākhyāna, or Pañchākhyānaka, made this old nīti-work popular all over India, including Indo-China and Indonesia The Pañchākhyāna, in Sanskrit and in different vernaculars, became indeed so popular a book in all these countries, that its Jain origin was completely forgotten, even by the Jains themselves

'The Bauddha story-tellers, moreover, turn to their advantage the rage of the populace for the miraculous, the horrid, and the atrocious, they repeat, over and over again, the same motives in the same stories, and they have no idea of psychological motivation and causation Their stories are characteristic Buddhist, but by no means characteristic Indian stories

'Characteristic of Indian narrative art are the narratives of the Jains They describe the life and the manners of the Indian population in all its different classes, and in full accordance with reality Hence Jain narrative literature is, amongst the huge mass of Indian literature, the most precious source not only of folk-lore in the most comprehensive sense of the word, but also of the history of Indian civilisation

'The Jains' way of telling their tales differs from that of the Bauddhas in some very essential points Their main story is not that of the past, but that of the present, they do

[1] See the author's papers 'Die Erzählungsliteratur der Jaina' (Geist des Ostens I, 178ff) and Ein altindisches Narrenbuch' (Ber d Kgl Sächs Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, ph -h Kl 64 (1912), Heft 1)

not teach their doctrines directly, but indirectly, and there is no future Jina to be provided with a rôle in their stories

'It is evident that under these circumstances the Jain narrators are at complete liberty As they cannot possibly have the intention to make the persons of their stories act in accordance with morality, they are free to relate the old stories, as these stories have been handed down to them by literary or by popular tradition Whether the actions of the persons of their stories are moral or immoral, whether these persons become happy or unhappy, this is no concern of the story-teller For the moral teaching imparted by the story does not lie in the events themselves as they are related in the tale, but in the explanation which the Kevalin gives at the end of this story This Kevalin shows that all the misfortunes undergone by the persons which act a part in his narration, have been caused by bad deeds, and that all their good luck has been caused by good actions, done by them in their previous existences It is clear that this manner of teaching morals is applicable to any story whatsoever, as in every interesting story the creatures whose adventures are related in it, must needs undergo various vicissitudes The consequence of this fact is that no story-telling Jain monk is obliged to alter any story handed down to him, and that from this reason, Jain stories are much more reliable sources of folk-lore than the stories handed down in the books of the Bauddhas

'Jain monks, however, were not only reproductive, they were really productive of stories They invented new stories and novels for the sake of their propaganda books, and literary story-telling was taught in their schools' It is necessary, therefore, that the various Jaina narrative texts in Sanskrit, Prākrit, Apabhraṃśa and the post-Apabhraṃśa stages of our modern Indo-Āryan languages should be critically edited and studied with a view to enrich our knowledge of Indian life, literature and languages'

7 HARISENA, THE AUTHOR HIS PLACE AND DATE

In the annals of Indian literature, we come across a few authors bearing the name Hariseṇa (i) Hariṣeṇa, the stylistic panegyrist of Samudragupta[1] and the composer of the Allahabad pillar inscription of c A D 345 (ii) Harisena, the author of Apabhraṃśa Dharmaparīksā,[2] gives the following details about himself In the territory of Mevāda, there was one Hari, expert in various arts, in the Dhakkada-kula of Siri-ujaura (v 1 Siri-ojapura) He had a pious son Govaddhana (Sk Govardhana) by name Guṇavatī was his wife, and she was devoted to the feet of Jina They had a son Harisena who became famous as a learned poet He left Cittaudu (Sk Citrakūta) and came to Acalapura on some business (*niya-kajje*) There he studied metrics and rhetorics, and narrated or composed this Dharmaparīksā when 1044 years of the Vikrama era had elapsed He says that the Dharmaparīksā was formerly composed by Jayarāma in gāthā metre and the same he is narrating in Paddhadiyā metre Harisena's work is older by 26 years than the Sanskrit Dharmaparīksā of Amitagati (iii) Harisena or Hari, the author of the Karpūraprakara or Sūktāvalī which has been already introduced above (p 43) He tells us that he wrote Nemicaritra also, and his teacher was Vajrasena, the author of Trisastisāra-prabandha His date is not definitely settled If this Vajrasena is identical with the author of an

[1] Keith A History of Sanskrit Literature, pp 77f

[2] This was lately discovered by me, I read a paper on it at the Hyderabad Session of the All-India Oriental Conference, and it is now published in the Silver Jubilee Number of the Annals of the B O R I, Poona

incomplete Triṣaṣtiśalākā-puruṣacaritra in Sanskrit prose[1], then we will have to put him later than Hemacandra, and in that case, Hari is sufficiently later than 12th century A D All that is definite about his date is that he is earlier than Samvat 1504 (-57=1447 A D.), when Somacandra wrote his Kathā-mahodadhi[2] giving illustrative stories on the Sūktāvalī. (iv) Harisena, or Pandita Hariseṇa, according to the Poona Ms (No 266 *a* of A 1882-83, Bhandarkar O R I) composed Jagatsundarī-yogamālādhikāra on the basis of various medical treatises when the Yoniprābhrta was not accessible to him The problems about his personality and date and relation of his composition with that of Yaśahkīrti[3] can be solved only after some more material becomes available to enable us to study the mutilated Ms at Poona The Ms was written in Samvat 1582 (-57=1525 A D) which is the later limit for the age of this Hariṣena (v) Hariseṇa, who had written some Yaśodharacarita,[4] is mentioned along with Prabhañjana (who appears to be referred to by Uddyotanasūri in his Kuvalayamālā, A D 778) by Vāsavasena in his Yaśodharacarita which was used by Gandharva in supplementing Puspadanta's Jasaharacariu in Samvat 1365 (-57=1308 A D) Somakīrti also refers to him in his Yaśodharacarita (Sam 1535) (vi) Harisena, the author of Astāhnikakathā of which we have a Ms (No 469 of 1884-86) in the Bhandarkar O R I, Poona He belonged to Mūlasangha, and he gives his spiritual ancestry thus Ratnakīrti, *Devakīrti, Śīlabhūsana, Gunacandra and Hariṣena (the author himself)* From its appearance, the Ms may be about two hundred years old [5]

Our Harisena, the author of Brhat-kathākośa, is different from all the above Harisenas that I have been able to list It is not unlikely, however, that Harisena (No v), referred to by Vāsavasena and Somakīrti, might be identical with our author who gives an exhaustive story about Yaśodhara (No 73) in this Kośa, but we have no sufficient evidence to establish this identity The Praśasti gives Harisena's spiritual ancestry thus There was that Maunibhaṭṭāraka, the full moon in the firmament of the Punnāta-samgha, who enlightened the pious people by the flash of his scriptural knowledge, he stayed at Vardhamānapura which was crowded with Jaina temples, white palaces and wealthy populace His pupil was that revered Śrīhariṣena who possessed various virtues and practised different penances His disciple was that pious Bharatasena who was a poet well-versed in different branches of learning, metrics, rhetorics, poetics, dramaturgy, grammar and logic, and who was attended upon by the learned Of this famous Bharatasena, there was the disciple Hari sena (the author himself) who does not claim to possess any (expert) knowledge of grammar, metrics and logic[6], and it is he that composed this Kathākośa (which is called *ārādhanoddhrtah*) It was finished in 989 according to Vikramāditya-kāla, or in 853 according to Śaka-kāla, in the twentyfourth year Khara by name, during the reign of Vinayādikapāla This is just a running summary of the facts given by our author in the Praśasti, and it is

[1] Jesalmere Catalogue, p 53

[2] Its contents and date are noted above, pp 43-4

[3] See the details discussed by Pts Jugalkishore, Dipachand Pandya and Premi in the Anekānta, vol II, pp 485f , 611f , 666f , 685f

[4] Hiralal Jaina Sāhitya Samśodhaka, II, 3, p 146, P L Vaidya Jasaharacariu, Intro pp 17, 24-5, Premi Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, p 539

[5] Mr Modi reads the name of Śrī-Hariṣena in a passage from the Apabhramśa Harivamśa of Svayambhū (Bhāratīya Vidyā, Hindī, vol I, 2, pp 167, 175), but Prof Hiralal reads differently and gives the name of Śrī-Harṣa (Nagpur University Journal, No 1, December 1935) So Mr Modi's reference cannto be used, for the present, to enumerate one more Hariṣeṇa or to identify him with Śrī-Hariṣena, mentioned in the Praśasti of this Kathākośa

[6] That is his modesty

necessary to scrutinise them critically and understand them in relation to other well-known facts

Punnāta-visaya or the territory of Punnāta, according to Harisena himself, is to be located in the Daksināpatha or South India (Nos 131 40, 135 1), and from earlier discussions[1] it is clear that it is to be identified with one of the ancient kingdoms of Karnātaka, through which flowed Kāveri and Kapinī, the capital of which was Kīrtipura or the present Kittur on the Kapinī, and which lay to the south of the present Mysore state including the Heggaddevanakote and other Tālukas in it The Punnāta-samgha must have derived its name from this territory It is really significant that, so far as I know, there has come to light no inscription in the South which mentions this Samgha In all probability, an ascetic group that hailed from Punnāta and settled down at Vardhamānapura and round about became famous as Punnāta-samgha there In the south, originally it was perhaps known as Kittūra-samgha, a name derived from the capital of Punnāta country, which is mentioned in one of the Śravana Beḷgola inscriptions[2] of *c* Śaka 622 Besides our Harisena, the only author that mentions Brhat- or simply Punnāta-samgha or -gana is Jinasena who finished his Harivamśa[3] at the same Vardhamāna-nagara in A D 783, just 148 years earlier than this Kathākośa We do not know much about this Samgha[4], but the facts given by Jinasena and Harisena show that it had a sound tradition of spiritual ancestry,[5] and it was already established at Vardhamānapura and round about by the beginning of the 8th century A D

A few facts, which go to indicate the possibility of Punnātasamgha hailing from the South, may be noted here Jainism was a powerful religion of Karnātaka and round about especially in the second half of the first millennium of the Christian era, and it enjoyed a good deal of royal patronage under different dynasties[6] Some of the Karnātaka kings like Pulikeśin II (A D 608 onwards) of the Western Chālukya dynasty conquered the Lātas, the Gurjaras of Broach etc , and a collateral branch of the Chālukyas was founded in Gujarāta The Jaina poet Ravikīrti (A D 634) enjoyed the favour of Pulikeśin II Vikramāditya II invaded Cutch, Sorath and Broach Some of the kings of the Rāstrakūta dynasty had close contacts with Gujarāta At the time of Kakkarāja II a separate Rāstrakūta principality was established in Gujarāta, and Amoghavarsa I, whose partiality towards Jainism is well-known[7], was styled as Gurjara-narendra[8] This successful political domination of Karnātaka dynasties, which patronised Jainism, over Gujarāta and adjoining territory presents quite favourable circumstances for the migration of a Jaina Samgha from

[1] Rice Mysore and Coorg from she Inscriptions pp 2f , R Narasimhacharya F C II pp 37, 73, B A Saletore The Ancient Kingdom of Punnāṭa, Indian Culture, vol III, 2, pp 303-17 M G Pai Rulers of Punnāṭa, Festschrift Prof P V Kane, Poona 1941, pp 308-26

[2] Epigraphia Carnatica II, No 81

[3] Published in the Māṇikachandra D Jaina Granthamālā, vols 31 and 33

[4] Pt, Premiji's views about the relation of Punnāṭasamgha with Drāviḍa and Nandisamgha are mere conjectures See also his Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, pp 420-33

[5] Amitasena, the grand-teacher of Jinasena, is called *pavitra-punnāṭa-ganāgranīr ganī* The phrase *yyutsrsṭ āpara-samgha-samtati* perhaps implies its isolation from its co-related groups

[6] Smith The Early History of India pp 423f , Banerji Prehistoric, Ancient and Hindu India pp 20f , Saletore Mediaeval Jainism chap 2 etc , Sharma Jainism and Karnāṭaka Culture, chap 1

[7] Prof Hiralalaji has lately shown, in an important paper, that the statement of Praśnottara-ratnamālā, that Amoghavarṣa accepted renunciation is further confirmed by the opening verses of Gaṇitasārasamgrahā of Mahāvīrācārya, see Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara, vol IX, part 1, pp 1-8

[8] I have in view the unpublished Praśasti of Jayadhavalā which I have copied from the Sholapur Ms.

Karnāṭaka to Gujarāta Secondly, the name of Nannarāja, whose Vasati is referred to by Jinasena, is quite South Indian in pronunciation; and we know that this name was usual in the South, for instance, the patron of Puspadanta at Mānyakheta was Nanna It would be a quite probable conjecture that this Nanna might have been a Jaina chieftain from the South who had settled down at Vardhamānapura and built a temple of Pārśvanātha Lastly, this Kathākośa refers to many South Indian territories and towns, and Harisena is the first author, so far as we know, to describe the Tera caves all this indicates the contact of the Punnāta-samgha with the topography and the holy relics of Karnātaka and round about Thus there was every possibility of a Jaina Samgha migrating to Gujarāta and Kathiawar.

Mauni Bhattāraka is referred to in some records[1], but beyond the name there are no positive facts to propose his identity with the one who was staying at Vardhamānapura as mentioned in the Praśasti Harisena's adjective *kārtasvarāpūrna-janādhivāse* reminds us of Jinasena's description *kalyānaih parivardhamāna-vipula-śrī-Vardhamāne pure*, and I feel no doubt that both of them are referring to the same town Presumably from the names Punnāta-samgha and Nannarāja, Pt Premiji once thought that this town must have been situated in the South[2] There are at least three modern localities which can be proposed for identification with Vardhamānapura (*i*) The Citracampū was composed by Citrasena[3] of Burdwan (Vardhamānapura) in Bengal about A D 1744 (*ii*) There is a reference to Vardhamānanagarī in the Anumkonda inscription[4] of Kākatīya Rudradeva, dated Śaka 1084, which gives a graphic description of a certain Bhīma and of Rudradeva's expedition against him It states that Rudradeva advanced 'three or four steps' from his camp and took the city of Vardhamānanagarī which from the context appears to have been not far away from Anumkonda in the Nizam's dominions The village is known now under the name Vadhmān[5] (*iii*) The medieval name for Wadhwan in Kathiawar was Vardhamānapura where Merutunga finished his Prabandhacintāmani in the year 1361 of the Vikrama era[6] Thus we have to see whether our Vardhamānapura was located in Bengal, Deccan or Kathiawar

The validity of identification depends upon the fulfilment of certain conditions already mentioned by Jinasena and Harisena Jinasena wrote his Harivamśa at Vardhamānapura when Indrāyudha was ruling in the North, Śrīvallabha, the son of Krsna-nrpa, in the South, Vatsarāja, the king of Avanti, in the East, and in the West, Vīra Jayavarāha over the Sauramaṇdala[7] Harisena, just 148 years later, associates one Vinayādikapāla with Vardhamānapura These conditions are not fulfilled, so far as the available material is concerned, by locating that town in Bengal or Deccan, but by accepting its identity with Wadhwan with reference to which the directions are to be understood, all the facts can

[1] See Maunideva E C VIII, Nagar No 35, Mauniyācāriya E C II, 106, Mauniguru E C II, 8, 20, Moni Bhaṭṭāraka E C V, Belur 123, also Mediaeval Jainism p 201

[2] Jaina Hitaishi, Vol, XIV 7-8, pp 216-12, but he has lately corrected his view, see Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, p 424, pp 428, 434 f

[3] I owe this reference to my friend Mr P K Gode, Poona

[4] Indian Antiquary, Vol XI, p 9 ff

[5] I owe this reference to my friend Mr R S Panchamukhi, Dharwar,

[6] Peterson's Reports IV, p xcvi

[7] That is how Pt Premiji and myself understand the verse, and I think, it is a consistent interpretation Some have differently interpreted it Bhandarkar The Early History of the Deccan, Collected Works, III, pp 89-90, Jinavijayaji Jaina Sāhitya Samśodhaka, III, 2 p 188, Hiralalaji Ibidem, II, 3, p 147, Banerji Prehistoric, Ancient and Hindu India, p 213

be satisfactorily explained[1] Indrāyudha is identified with Indrarāja of Kanauja whose territory appears to have extended sufficiently westwards, Śrīvallabha with Govinda II, the son of Krsna I, of the Rāstrakūta dynasty in the South, Vatsarāja, the king of Avanti, with the Gurjara-Pratihāra ruler of that name, and Vīra Jayavarāha might have been some king ruling over Sauramandala or Saurāstra about whom we do not know anything from other sources[2] These directions and ruling kings are suitable only for Wadhwan with which alone, as we see below, can be associated a king Vinayādikapāla mentioned by Harisena So this Kathākośa was composed near about Wadhwan in Kathiawar It is presumed, of course, that Harisena should be associated with the same locality with which one of his predecessors was connected I have not been able to get any additional information about Śrīharisena and Bharatasena

As to the year of composition, the author is quite explicit he wrote this Kośa in Vikrama Sam 989 or Śaka 853, the year being Khara which is twentyfourth in enumeration Referring to Pillai's Ephemeris[3], I find that Khara would be twenty fourth according to the Northern cycle, but twentyfifth according to the Southern cycle where Śukla is additional after Vibhava, the second year So Harisena, living near about Wadhwan, is calculating according to the Northern cycle It appears that the book was finished sometime between 15th October 931 to 13th March 932 A D [4]

As the reading stands, the name of the contemporary king would be Vināyakapāla or even Vinayapāla, if we induce ourselves to suppose that the usual *k*-suffix is added to *ādi* We have to see whether there is available any such name of a ruling prince round about our Vardhamānapura and about A D 931-32 There is some difference of opinion about the relation between Mahīpāla and Vināyakapāla of the Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty[5], but this much is certain that Vināyakapāla was in possession of the capital Kanauj A D 931 We have a grant of his issued from Mahodaya (Kanauj) dated Samvat 988, only one year earlier than the composition of the Kathākośa Then there are the Haddala copper-plates, dated Śaka 836, of the Cāpa-mahāsāmantādhipati, Dharanī-Varāha, a feudatory of the Rājādhirāja Mahīpāladeva, issued from Vardhamāna Pratihāra empire was a big one extending from the Kathiawar to the borders of Bihar, and the 'Government was more or less feudal in nature, and its rapid dissolution was due to the 'centrifugal tendency' which is still observable among the Rajputs' The above records make it clear that the Vardhamānapura was included in the Pratihāra empire a few years early and there was the king Vināyakapāla in A D 931 I feel convinced that Harisena is referring to Vināyakapāla, the suzerain king, and not to any local chief of Vardhamānapura, and this is perhaps implied by the adjective *Śakropamānake* There is, however, one difficulty which needs some

[1] Ray The Dynastic History of Northern India, vol I, pp 279, 285, 287 etc

[2] A feudatory of the name Dharanīvarāha is mentioned in a record of A D 914 and associated with Vardhamānapura, as noted below It is quite likely that Jayavarāha was a predecessor of the same branch

[3] An Indian Ephemeris, vol II, pp 264-66

[4] The contemporary Rāṣṭrakūṭa king in the South was Govinda IV (A D 918-33)

[5] D R Bhandarkar A list of Inscriptions of Northern India, Epigraphia Indica, vols XIX to XXIII, No 53 of Samvat 988, No 61 of Samvat 1003, No 68 of Samvat 1011, No 1086 of Śaka 836 (Haḍḍālā copper-plates), see also his paper 'Gurjaras', Bombay Branch R A S XXI, pp 414f, Barnett Antiquities of India pp 62, 67, Ray The Dynastic History of Northern India, pp 571-582 where all the details are worked out and the basic records are fully summarised, Banerji Prehistoric, Ancient and Hindu India, pp 234, 236, H C Ray Chaudhari On the Emperor Mahīpāla of the Pratihāra Dynasty, Indian Culture, VII, 2

explanation The text would give the name Vinayapāla or Vinayakapāla, while the king's name is Vināyakapāla It is true that our author is in the habit of using *k*-suffix, but here, I think, in all probability the original reading might have been *Vināyādikapālasya* (apparently meaningless, if one is not aware of the name of the king) which gives us the name Vināyakapāla It is quite likely that Vināyādi- was easily corrected into Vinayādi- by some copyist who could not make out anything from Vināyādi- and who thought that his was a meaningful improvement of *vināya* into *vinaya* Our author is in the habit of such division of words by inserting *ādi* etc, as I have shown above, in phrases like *paryādivrājikā*

Unfortunately no other work of Harisena has come to light, so there is no possibility, for the present, of supplementing and checking the above information To conclude, Harisena belonged to Punnātasamgha, he composed his Kathākośa near about Wadhawan in Kathiawar, it was finished in Śaka 853, Samvat 989 or A D 931-32 during the Khara Samvatsara, and the contemporary sovereign king was Vināyakapāla of the Gujrara-Pratihāra dynasty of Kanauj

THE DHŪRTĀKHYĀNA: A CRITICAL STUDY*

1 The Prakrit Text

The Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadrasūri, whose career is to be assigned to the middle of 8th century A D ,[1] is a typical literary work that has a special significance in Indian literature It had already attracted the attention of E Leumann some forty years back; and it is through him that N Mironow could refer to some parallel stories in his dissertation[2] on the Dharmaparīksā of Amitagati Some Gujarāti and Hindī renderings of Dhū have appeared in India, but they were primarily concerned with the contents and not with the Prākrit text of that work

This unique work, in Prākrit, is now brought out for the first time in this Singhi Jain Series having been critically edited by Ācārya Śrī Jinavijayji Its Sanskrit version by Sanghatilaka and an Old-Gujarāti prose rendering by an unknown writer have also been included in this edition to facilitate its comparative study

The Prākrit text, presented here, is based on three MSS , A, B, and C[3] They do not bear any dates, but A and B, as described by the learned editor in his Preface, look quite old, and they may be assigned to 16th century A D C is quite modern and just a copy of A prepared by an inexperienced scribe, consequently the readings of C are not noted A and B are sufficiently independent and do show some variants noted in the foot-notes Confusion in numbering the verses is seen in both B looks not only older but is also more accurate than A The MS A shows necessarily *y-śrutī* for the *udvṛtta* vowel (as I surmise, irrespective of the preceding vowel), while B very often puts *a* (or *ā*) for the lost consonant this possibly means that B is following the more strict rule about *y-śrutī* specified by Hemacandra in his Commentary[4], and its so-called accuracy perhaps betrays the hand of some revisionist or copyist possessing a thorough mastery over Hemacandra's Prākrit grammar

These two MSS , A and B, do not show any recensions as such If B omits a verse (V 26) and A repeats some line (V 47), this is due just to scribal lapse The concluding verse (V 125) cannot belong to Haribhadra His composition ends with V 124 which mentions *bhava-viraha*, Haribhadra's distinguishing mark, and the contents of the following verse do betray that it is composed by some zealous follower of Haribhadra Certain portions of the Prākrit text are not specifically covered by the Sanskrit (III 83*b*, 84, V 115-18) and Gujarāti versions (III 83-84, V 111) which closely follow it, but looking to the context etc , this cannot be a conclusive proof to suspect those portions as later additions in Haribhadra's text

* This is the Introduction of the Dhūrtākhyāna, in Prākrit, by Haribhadra It was published in the Singhi Jain Series, No 19, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavana, Bombay 1944

[1] Jinavijayaji Jaina Sāhitya Samśodhaka, vol I, 1, pp 21-58, Jacobi Samarāiccakahā, B I , No 169, Calcutta 1926, Intro

[2] Die Dharmaparīkṣā des Amitagati, Leipzig 1903

[3] For their description, see elsewhere

[4] See Siddha-Hemacandra, VIII 1 180

At the kind request of Ācārya Śrī Jinavijayji, I have attempted below a study of this important literary work Before subjecting its different aspects to a critical scrutiny, it would be proper to give a short outline of the stories occurring in this work

2. Summary of the Contents

I

Adjacent to the prosperous town of Ujjainī, there was a fine park of luxuriant vegetation with a garden-house During their wanderings there arrived hundreds of confirmed rogues who had acquired specific proficiency in the tricks of their trade They had five leaders Mūlaśrī, Kandarīka, Elāsādha, Śaśa and Khandapānā[1] Every one of the first four had five hundred male cheats and Khandapānā had an equal number of female cheats as their retinue Mūlaśrī was their foremost chief During the height of rainy season when it was heavily pouring all over the week and when it was not possible to move about all the rogues, shivering and hungry, began to deliberate as to who would give them a feast for the day Mūladeva[2] stipulated thus 'Every one should address the chamber of cheats about what one had heard or experienced, and he who proves it to be an incredible lie should give food and drink to the gathering of rogues But he who confirms the same by quoting parallels from various scriptures like the Purāna, Bhārata and Rāmāyana and convinces the audience, is not to give anything, and he would be made the lord of rogues' They all agreed to this and requested Mūladeva to narrate his experience (I 1-16)

Mūladeva said 'I shall tell you what I experienced as a youth Yearning for prosperity, I went to the abode of Īśvara to receive the stream of Gangā on my head As I was travelling with a gourd-kettle and umbrella in hand, a mad wild-elephant rushed at me like a moving mountain I trembled with fear, I saw no shelter and escape, so I lept into the gourd-kettle that my life might be saved The elephant was infuriated and followed me into the gourd-kettle where I deceived it by hide-and-seek for a period of six months At last I escaped through the spout of the gourd-kettle, but when the elephant also followed me, its tail-hair was caught in the spout-hole I approached, however the ocean-like river Gangā, crossed the rushing stream, and reached the abode of Īśvara Standing hunger and thirst, I received the stream of Gangā on my head for six months Thence I came to Ujjainī and met you all here If you accept all this as true, confirm it by evidence, if you think this to be a lie, well, give us a feast' Kandarīka observed that one who has read Bhārata, Purānas and Rāmāyana would not call this a lie (I 17-34)

Kandarīka continued 'What we hear in the Bhārata and Purāna is reliable, therefore your experience also is true (1) It is said that the Vipras are born from the mouth, the Ksatriyas from the arms, Vaiśyas from the thighs and Śūdras from the feet of Brahman that means the entire population could be accommodated in Brahman's body (2) Umā could lead a married life with Īsvara whose male organ could not be measured even by Brahman and Visnu (3) The saint Vyāsa has narrated thus in the Bhārata 'The chief queen of Virāta king had no progeny She propitiated a certain saint who asked her to go to the bamboo-bower and eat the dish whereby she would have one hundred children

[1] For the convenience of general readers I have given the names in Sanskrit, though some of them appear to be un-Sanskritic in origin

[2] Mūladeva and Mūlaśri are alternative names

She did so and went home After some time there arrived the saint Gāgali[1] and sat practising austerities under the bamboo-grove He glanced passionately at the nude nymphs bathing in the lake, and out of his first drop of semen there was born Kīcaka, as mighty as elephant Thus were generated one hundred Kīcakas who were all first accommodated in bamboos and who were later received by the queen' (4) Gangā was deluded by Hara in his matted hair for one thousand years (5) Visnu, the creator of the world, was practising penance on the bed of ocean, the lotus-seated Brahman, with staff and gourd in hand, came out of the navel of Viṣṇu, but the lotus was caught stuck there (6) It is narrated in the Bhārata that Brahman began practising penance for thousand years, and the jealous gods wanted to frustrate his efforts Indra counselled thus 'Woman has been a mighty temptress, and none except Mahāvīrā could stand the arrows of Madana Seeing the limbs of Umā, Paśupati became passionate even at the sacred hour of marriage, and Dronācārya was generated from the semen-drop fallen in a pot Similarly eminent personalities like Gautama, Vasistha,[2] Pārāśara, Jamadagni, Kāśyapa, Agastya, Indra, Hara, Hari, etc , are all victims of cupid So Tilottamā should be sent to tempt Brahman, and thus his penance would be destroyed' Accordingly Tilottamā approached Brahman in a beautiful dress and began to dance before him like a Campaka flower When Brahman began to gaze at her, she stood dancing by his right side With a passionate craze for her Brahman developed four faces, as she shifted herself in different directions When she jumped up, he had on his head a fifth face, but it was plucked by Rudra Brahman was very much irritated and infuriated From the drop of perspiration on his forehead was born Svedakundalin[3] who at Brahman's order, overthrew Śamkara (=Rudra=Īśvara=Hara) who ran to Visnu for alms while the latter was practising penance in the Badarikāsrama Visnu opened the vein on his forehead, but the skull of Brahman, which Īśvara held, could not be filled When Īśvara dipped his finger in the blood, a man Raktakundalin by name, was generated At Rudra's behest Raktakundalin fought against Svedakundalin Their long battle was declared drawn by the gods, one was given in charge of the Sun and the other in charge of Indra so that they might continue their fight in the Bhārata war When the Sun was enamoured by Kuntī's beauty and cohabited with her, Karna was conceived by her and delivered through the ear (7) It has been narrated in the Rāmāyana that Pavanasuta, a monkey, crossed the ocean by his arms at the order of Rāghava and reached Lankā (8) For the benefit of the world, Gangā was invited from the heaven by gods, and her stream was received on the head by Īsvara for thousands of years

If the above events are acceptable, then that you were accommodated with the elephant in the gourd-kettle (Nos 1-3),[4] that you deluded it for six months (No 4), that its tail-hair was stuck in the spout (No 5), that you could escape through the spout (No 6), that you crossed Gangā (No 7), and that you received her stream on your head (No 8) are all quite true You are a good man endowed with wisdom and fame' (I 35-93)

[1] Gāgali perhaps stands for Garga

[2] I have normalised these names according to the popular usage

[3] Both Sanskrit and Gujarātī Texts read Sīta-or Śveta-kuṇḍalin which has no etymological justification *Śveta or sīta* is being used to balance against *rakta*, but we have to remember that one is born from *sveda* and the other from *rakta*

[4] In round brackets are given the numbers of legends, noted above, in the light of which particular remarks are said to be true

II

Being requested by Mūlaśrī, Kandarīka began to narrate his experiences 'Naughty as I was in my boyhood, my parents drove me out of the house I reached a rich village on the frontier There a Yakṣa, Kamaladala by name, lived under the Vata tree, he possessed miraculous powers, and he bestowed boons on women A fair was held in his honour, and people gathered together in gallant dress I joined the fair, paid respects to the deity, and attended the horse-play All of a sudden there was an attack from a well-equipped party of robbers, consequently one and all from the fair, even the horses, entered into a cucumber, the sports continued therein, and the party of robbers returned saying that the village had disappeared There arrived a flock of animals, a goat swallowed that cucumber, a boa gulped that goat, and a crane flew up to the top of the Vaṭa tree, after eating up the boa A king was camping under that tree Mistaking the crane's leg for a banyan-shoot, a mad elephant was tied to it by the driver When the crane took up its leg, the elephant was lifted up, and the driver raised a cry that some one snatched away his animal Skilled archers rushed forth and shot the crane dead It fell lifeless on the earth like a mountain-peak At the king's order, its stomach was opened, and vivisection was continued on the inner contents, till at last all the people, horses, etc came out like a swarm of moths from a nest They went to their respective places, and I went home I have myself experienced all this, well, if you disbelieve, give us a feast' (II 1-25)

Elāsādha, who had studied Purāna, Bhārata, etc , at once said that whatever Kandarīka described was quite believable without any doubt He continued to confirm the same '(1) According to the Visnupurāna, in the beginning, when the five elements had not come into existence, there was the extensive ocean on the waves of which rolled an egg for a long time It broke into two halves, and out of one half came this earth Thus all the living beings, gods, men, beasts, etc , were found accommodated in that egg (2) In the Aranyaparvan, Mārkandeya has narrated his experience to Dharmaputra thus 'At the time of universal deluge, when there was water everywhere and the world was devoid of living habitation, an extensive and lofty Vata tree was seen A handsome boy was seated on a bed which was spread on its branches The saint Mārkandeya stretched his arms to receive the boy[1] lest he might succumb to the floods He visualised in the stomach of that boy the whole world with its mountains and forests He entered the stomach and dwelt there for one thousand years, but could not reach its end so he came out at last Thus a child's stomach could contain the whole world' (3) Devakī's waist was so slender that it could be caught in a fist, still Kesava dwelt in her womb, and his stomach contained the earth with its mountains, forests, etc (4) Without being suffocated to death, all the people on the earth lived comfortably in the stomach of Vāsudeva and continued their activities such as agriculture, trade, battle, festivals, etc There is no doubt that the world was contained in Kesava's stomach Once Brahman claimed that he is the creator (*kartā*), because the four Varnas emerged from his mouth, arms, thighs and feet, but Keśava retorted that his claim was ridiculous and that he (Brahman) was as good as his boy Kesava continued that the earth and sky formed the cavity, the mountains his jaws and the ocean his tongue, if necessary, Brahman should enter his stomach and see that the whole world was there Kesava further added that Brahman was ungratefully talking thus when he too was born from his navel (5) At the time of Draupadī's self-choice, it is reported that the mighty bow of Drupada was presided over by deities Drupada announced that he who strung his

[1] If we read *risino*, then it would mean that the boy received that saint

bow and shot the specified target would win the hand of Draupadī. Many kings failed to string it. That mighty Śiśupāla[1] was nearly successful, but Kṛṣṇa frustrated his attempt by putting into the bow some additional weight in the form of elephants, mountains, planets, etc. The bow was so heavy that even the earth could not bear the load. Arjuna, however, took the aid of Bhīma's palm for its support, ably strung the bow, and successfully hit the target. Draupadī was given to him in marriage. Thus the bow could contain mountains, planets, etc. (6) We hear in the Rāmāyana that Jaṭāyu, the vulture, fought with his wings against Rāvana who cut his wings in the fight, and when Jatāyu fell on the ground, he appeared as big as Mandara mountain. Sītā blessed him that his wings would be restored after meeting the messenger of Rāma. Hanumat was sent by Rāma in search of Sītā, and he mistook for a mountain that body of Jatāyu who gave him the necessary information about her. Jatāyu got the wings and flew to the heaven. So it means that a vulture can be as big as the Mandara mountain.

If the above events are true, then quite reliable are the incidents that the whole village could be accommodated in a cucumber (Nos. 1-3), that all the people could come out of it with their lives safe (No. 4), that a crane could contain all that (No. 5), and that there could be a big crane of that description (No. 6).' (II. 26-75)

III

Elāsādha narrated his experiences thus: 'In my youth, greedy as I was, I pursued the fad of metallic transmutation and wandered everywhere in search of the specific juice, etc. On getting the information, I travelled a long distance with step covering hundred Yojanas, lifted a huge lid-stone, took the necessary juice from the golden pond, put the lid as before, and then returned home. Through the favour of that fluid, I had plenty of wealth and abundant possessions: servants waited on me, bards praised me, and young girls sang and danced round me. I gave gifts to the poor and needy. Hearing about my wealth, a party of well-equipped robbers besieged my palace at night. I thought, I must defend my well-earned property. With a bow in hand I fought against them and finished many of them on the spot. The rest of them attacked me at once, cut my head, put it on the *badara* tree, and went away after robbing all my property. My head comfortably began eating the *badara* fruits, and this was seen by people early in the morning. They realized that it was still living and joined all my limbs, and here I stand before you in person. If you find my personal experience unreliable, well, then give a feast.' (III. 1-19)

Śaśa affirmed that Elāsādha's experience was quite reliable, because there are similar cases in Purānas, Bhārata and Rāmāyana. (1) Jamadagni suspected the fidelity of his wife Renukā who was enamoured of king Aśvāpahṛta and ordered his son (Paraśu-) Rāma to cut her head. He was pleased with his son Rāma who carried out the order and asked him to demand a boon. Rāma solicited that his mother should be restored to life, and she was made alive by Jamadagni. (2) The two halves of his body were conjoined by Jarā, and later on he became the great king Jarāsamdha. (3) The gods conspired to destroy the two mighty brothers, Sunda and Nisunda, who proved a terror to them. They contributed bits from their bodies and thus created an extremely beautiful nymph, Tilottamā by name. Humbly she received orders from gods and started on her mission to destroy

[1] The text reads Śaśipāla.

the two brothers Seeing her tempting limbs, Sunda and Nisunda grew passionate for her, they fought mutually for her sake and destroyed each other Thus the gods could create Tilottamā by putting bits from their own bodies (4) In his childhood Hanumat was instructed by his mother Añjanā that he was to eat red fruits whenever hungry He mistook the sun for a fruit, and when he jumped up to snatch the solar orb, his body was reduced to pieces Seeing his wife lamenting and the son killed, Pavana became enraged and retired to Pātāla There was no breeze in the world, and people were very much worried The gods approached and appeased him The limbs of his son were put together, and he was made alive His chin was missing, so in the absence of it, he came to be called Hanumat Thus Hanumat could be made alive by putting together bits of his body (5) When Rāma went to Lankā, a fierce fight ensued between his army and that of Rāvana In course of fight prince Laksmana fell heavily wounded, and Rāma began to lament Hanumat, however, went to Dronagiri and brought Niśśalyā herb Not only Laksmaṇa was cured thereby but all the monkeys that were lying wounded were also healed and made alive (6) Śiva and Pārvatī were enjoying amorous pleasure in a Himālayan cave for a long time, and all the gods were anxious, because they did not want any progeny from them After long deliberations, they decided that Agni, obliging as he was, should go to Īśvara who might then perhaps abstain from coition Agni was rather unwilling, because Śiva was a terrible and uncongenial fellow Indra, however, prevailed upon Agni who was assured that Śiva would certainly behave better in the company of Umā Though intervened by Umā, Īśvara was enraged to see Agni there and forced him to drink his semen Agni was in flames as it were due to that semen, he rushed to the ocean, and he felt some relief only after vomiting it there It is said that jewels arose out of this semen Whatever bit was still remaining in his stomach Agni vomitted in a lotus-lake Six nymphs, called Krttikā, were bathing in that lake, and they happened to conceive at the contact of semen After the necessary period of time, they delivered the head, arms, thighs, trunk, etc When they brought together the limbs with surprise, they got joined mutually at their proper places, and thus Mahāsena was born He leads the rigorous life of a celibate and dwells in a forest in the South Thus the limbs produced from different wombs could get joined and Mahāsena could be produced (7) Rāhu has no head, still he moved in the sky and swallows (or eclipses) the sun and the moon (8) Visnu, in the guise of a Dvija, begged of Bali only three steps of the ground, pervaded thereby the whole world, and deprived him of the earth (9) It is reported in the Rāmāyana that Hanumat, when Laksmana fell wounded in the battle between Rāma and Rāvana, brought the lofty mountain Drona with its vegetation, as he wanted some herb (10) Madhumatha, in his incarnation of Varāha, lifted up the earth with its mountains, trees, etc

If the above events are true, it is quite believable that the limbs of your body could get joined (Nos 1-6), that your head could taste *badara* fruits (No 7), that you could have a step measuring one hundred *yojanas* (No 8), and that you could lift up the heavy stone of the lid (Nos 9-10)' (III 20-98)

IV

Śaśa narrated his experience thus 'I have my field near the mountain, and once I went there from my village during autumn An elephant rushed on me from the mountain I trembled with fear and somehow managed to climb a lofty sesamum tree The elephant whirled round the tree, sesamum seeds were showered all round, and when they were

crushed under its hoofs, there was a flood of sesamum oil Stuck deep in mud, the elephant died of hunger and thirst I breathed a sigh of relief, got down the tree, drank some ten pots of sesamum oil and ate a load of seed-stuff, prepared a bag of that elephant's hide, filled it with oil, and entered my village after placing that bag on a tree outside I asked my son to bring the bag, but he could not see it, so he pulled out the tree and brought it home This is my personal experience, well, if any one does not believe all this, he should entertain us with a feast' (IV 1-13)

Khandapānā said that there were parallels to Śaśa's experience in the Bhārata, Rāmāyana etc She continued to confirm the same '(1) It is reported that, at Pātaliputra, a drum was carved from the wood of *māsa* plant (2) According to the Bhārata the ichor fluid of elephants flowed like a flooded river, washing down elephants, horses and chariots (3) Bhīmasena killed the demon Baka at Ekacakra and gulped pots of rice, a buffalo and a thousand jugs of wine (4) It is said that Kumbhakarṇa, whenever he woke up, ate hundreds of men and drank a thousand pots of water (5) According to Purānas, the saint Agastya drank the ocean in order to destroy Asuras (6) On her way from heaven, the river Gangā passed through the matted hair of Hara When she flowed through the hermitage of Jahnu, he gulped and retained her in his stomach for one thousand years (7) The saint Kāśyapa had two wives, Kadrū and Vinatā These cowives once betted the loser should either become a life-long slave of the other or give nectar for her freedom Vinatā became the slave of Kadrū who tried to disgrace her now and then She was always miserable Once she laid three eggs the first produced a half-grown scorpion, and the second, the thighless Aruna who later on became the charioteer of the sun She learnt a lesson, and broke the third egg after it was fully ripe The mighty Garuda was produced, and he proved a great danger to the sons of Kadrū who, on that account, constantly teased Vinatā On her being requested by Garuda, Vinatā explained to him how she was miserable due to her slavery and how she would be freed by the nectar the source of which was known to his blind father, now staying in the Badari Āśrama He went to Kāśyapa who recognised him by touch According to his father's wish, that hungry Garuda satisfied his hunger by eating a huge elephant and an equally huge tortoise which were constantly disturbing the lake by mutual quarrel On his way back he saw a huge, extensive Vata tree under which millions of Vālakhilya saints, the progeny of Brahman, were practising penance Garuda sat on its branches, but they cracked easily Fearing that the saints underneath might be killed, Garuda picked up that tree in his beak, flew across the sky to the great surprise of gods, and dropped it on an island which is known as Lankā and which is the abode of Rāvana Once more he feasted on the Nisādas He learnt from his father that the nectar-pond is situated beyond the hells and Pātāla, it is surrounded by burning flames, and that it is constantly guarded by gods, etc One has to offer oblations to the flames, and then perhaps it might be obtained He went there, satisfied the flames, and picked up the nectar-pot Gods equipped with arms and weapons pursued him, and a heavy battle took place with Garuda on one side and the rest on the other When the party of gods was routed away, Indra came on the field and used his missile without any effect He invoked the help of Viṣṇu who pursued Garuḍa with his Cakra Saints, planets, etc approached Visṇu and told him that it was below his dignity to follow Garuda like this Treaty was effected between the two, and Garuda became the banner of Visṇu Vinatā was set free by that nectar Thus the elephant and tortoise could be killed and the banyan tree could be carried by Garuda (8) When it was heavily raining for a week, Madhumatha lifted the mountain Govardhana (9) While building the dam

the monkeys brought mountains from a long distance and dropped them in the ocean (10) In destroying the park Hanumat easily rooted out big trees

If the above details are true, it is quite believable that there could be such a big sesamum tree (No 1), that there could be a stream of oil (No 2), that you could eat a load of seed-stuff and drink ten pots of oil (Nos 3-6), that you could carry the bag made of elephant-skin (Nos 7-8), and that your son could pull out the tree and carry it home (Nos 9-10)' (IV 14-94)

V

(*i*) Then that Khandapānā, the authoress of the Arthasāstra, suggested that all others should humble themselves before her to get a feast Of course they were too proud to fold their hands to her She smiled and began to narrate her experience 'In my youth I was enchantingly beautiful After the monthly bath, while sleeping in the veranda, I was enjoyed by the passionate Wind Immediately I delivered a son, and after taking my leave, he went away somewhere Tell me whether it is a lie, if it is true that the Wind can procreate a son, no barren woman would be found in this world' (V 1-10)

Mūladeva confirmed her experience thus '(1) According to popular scriptures, the Wind procreated Bhimasena from Kuntī and Hanumat from Nīlā (2) Vyāsa, born from Pārāśara and a fisher-women, Yojanagandhā by name, walked away soon after his birth, instructing his mother to remember him on occasions Through the favour of that saint, Yojanagandhā became a virgin again, was married to Śantanu and had a son Vicitravīrya who died without issues She remembered Vyāsa fearing that the family might become extinct, and he procreated Pāndu, Dhrtarāstra and Vidura, but cursed his bed-mates in the end In the light of these events, it is quite natural that the Wind generated a child in you, and it walked away immediately after delivery' (V 11-19)

(*ii*) Khandapānā narrated further 'Once my friend Umā entrusted me with miraculous syllables whereby I attracted the burning Sun who procreated in me a mighty son, but no harm was done to me' (3) Kandarīka said that it was quite possible, because Kuntī too was not burnt in any way by the Sun (who generated Karna from her) (V 20-23)

(*iii*) Khandapānā added further 'A second time I attracted Agni, the mouth of gods, by whom a brilliant son was born to me, and I was not burnt in the least How is it?' Elāsādha silenced her thus '(4) The wife of Yama was being enjoyed by Agni, but on seeing that her husband arrived there, she swallowed Agni Yama gulped her, and entered the assembly of gods who welcomed him as 'Mr yourself, the third' He vomitted his wife, and she vomitted Agni who ran into the forest being pursued by him The elephants did not give Yama any report[1], so he deprived them of their speech Thus if Yama's wife was not burnt, how could you be burnt?' (V 24-31)

(*iv*) Khandā added again that once she attracted Indra by whom she had a son, and she asked how Indra could come to her in preference to celestial nymphs Śaśa told her that it was quite possible (5) Ahalyā was enjoyed by Indra who thereby suffered heavily at the hands of Gautama and whose consequent bodily pores became his thousand eyes, (6) secondly, Kuntī also got a son by Indra (V 32-37)

[1] See the Sanskrit version of the Dhūrtākhyāna

(v) On her inquiry, Mūladeva told Khaṇḍapānā that she was the daughter of Nāgaśarman and Somaśrī of Pātaliputra and her Gotra was Gautama Khandapānā complained that her identity was confused, and narrated a bit of her biography thus 'My name is Dagdhikā, the artisan's daughter, wellknown among royal washer-men My profession has been low, though our family is quite prosperous Thousands of washermen worked under me, and with them, one day, I went to the river with a cart-load of clothes which were all washed clean and spread in the sunshine Suddenly they were blown off by a whirl-wind I asked the servants to run away and took the responsibility on me Lest the king might punish me, I assumed the form of a lizard and reached the city park at night Early morning I feared, I might be killed for a dish After a good deal of thought, I changed myself into a mango plant After day-break I heard the royal drum declaring all washermen to be excused, and once again I became a woman The leather straps, etc from the carts were eaten at night by jackals and dogs, but my father procured a mouse-tail out of which he got all of them once more prepared' Śaśa said that it is quite believable that the tail of a mouse was so big as to prepare straps, etc, (7) because we know that the male organ of Śiva was immeasurably long, and (8) because the tail of Hanumat was so long as to encircle the city of Lankā which was burnt by it on its being covered with clothes, sprinkled with oil and ignited He further added 'It is quite possible that you became a lizard and a mango plant, because we hear in the Purānas thus (9) Gandhārikāvara transformed himself into a Kurabaka tree (10) Then there was that mighty king Nahuṣa who vanquished Indra, but being cursed by Brhaspati, he became a boa in a forest When Pāndavas were banished into wilderness, the boa swallowed Bhīma Dharma gave necessary replies to the boa which consequently vomitted Bhīma and which became the king at last'

Khandapānā requested the rest of the rogues to accept quietly her authority, and then she would entertain them with a feast In case she were to defeat them actually, they would be as worthless as a broken cowrie The rogues thundered in reply that no one, not even a divine rogue, can vanquish them With a view to put them to shame, she continued her biography and addressed them further 'With king's permission, I visited many places in search of those clothes blown off by the wind I had lost, moreover, four of my servants since long, and in search of them I came here I find now that you are those very servants and that you are wearing those very clothes Either you accept this as true and be my slaves, or if you do not, well, give the feast' All of them felt ashamed, as they were outwitted, they accepted her as their chief, and they requested her to entertain all the rogues during the rainy week (V 38-78)

Khandapānā smiled to see that their manly vanity was smashed, but when they all insisted on getting a feast from her, she agreed to that She went to the burial ground which presented a hideous and horrible spectacle She managed to get a dead baby which was physically intact and lately dropped there After bathing it and muffling it in rags, she entered Ujjainī, approached a banker's mansion, and addressed the busy banker that she was a Brāhmin's daughter, that she had lately delivered a son, and that she was badly in need of money The busy banker got irritated and asked his servants to drive her out When force was used, she fell on the ground, and she started beating her breast etc and lamenting loudly that her son, the only hope of her life, was killed by the banker who was so proud of his wealth The banker was upset, and with all efforts tried to console her, requesting her not to raise a cry He gave her an ear-ring and asked her to remove the

child quietly She removed the dead body, and by that banker's gift everything was allright After throwing the dead babe, she went to the jewel-market jubilantly, she sold the ring and gave a rich feast to the rogues who were shivering with cold They all heartily congratulated her on her skill and generosity, and openly confessed that woman is wiser by birth than man (V 79-110)

In this world various personalities like Candra, Indra, Vāyu, Sūrya, Agni and Dharma are all oppressed by passions According to the scripture, Krsna is ubiquitous and all-pervasive[1], then where is the need of his thinking about those (Gopīs) who are anxious for him? There are many other unbelievable legends current in the world, such as, the origin of (Pavana) Ganapati[2] from the limbs of Pārvatī, the births of Brahman, Tilottamā, Urvaśī, Drona and Sanmukha, the release of Narakūbara through Krsna, the procreation of Svedakundala through anger and that of Nara (i e , Raktakundala) from a pot of blood, and the birth of Yadava Balarāma through Māyā's mediation Pārvatī was the daughter of mountain if mountains are to deliver children, the world would be too small for human population These and such other stories from the Bhārata and Rāmāyana are like artificial gold, and they do not stand the test of rational scrutiny The popular scriptures do not contain any attractive stuff Leaving them, therefore, one should follow the path preached by the Sarvajña with a steady and pure faith (V 111-22)

This fine Kathā, with its various legends, has been narrated to the pious residents of Citrakūta[3], it has been composed by Haribhadrasūri for purifying the faith, and may it bestow *bhava-viraha* on the faithful who hear and narrate it (V 123-24)

Let Haribhadra, the Śvetāmbara Sūri, who has such a faith in the brilliant Jaina doctrine, bestow welfare on us (V 125)

3 Purpose, Technique and Form

Whatever may be their historical explanation and symbolical signification, there are innumerable legends, scattered all over the epics and Purānas, which, on account of some detail or the other, are unnatural, inconsistent, exaggerated and unacceptable to reason The 'precious blossoms of immortal poetic art and profound wisdom' seen in the epics are often overpowered by an array of irrational legends 'It is only unpoetical theologians and commentators and clumsy copyists who have succeeded in conglomerating into a heterogeneous mass parts which are actually incompatible and which date from different centuries'[4] What is true of the Mahābhārata is much more true about the Purānas which are well-known for their sectarian multiplication of myths and legends and hyperbolic exaggeration of details Even from amongst the custodians and adherents of these texts the revisionists have tried their hands on them partly to make the legends conform to the changing ethico-moral notions and partly to rationalise and humanise them by removing glaring inconsistencies etc This is amply borne out by the recensions and textual variations detected by critical editors[5] The episode of Draupadī's marriage and

[1] Some of these verses present difficulties for interpretation

[2] Is there any implication here that Ganapati was the leader of the party of Maruts?

[3] The phrase *Citta ida-dugga-siri* clearly refers to the ancient fort on the crest of the hill For its description, see Peterson's Reports, I, pp 46 f

[4] Winternitz A History of Indian Literature, I, p 326

[5] The Ādiparvan, Poona 1933, Prolegomena, p 43 f

the way in which the later Kāvyas etc use the Purānic legends sufficiently illustrate the above tendencies We cannot expect the zealous follower to ridicule in any way the Purānic legends or to raise a moral protest against the sins in the world of gods, held by him in reverence That Kannada poet Sarvajña is an exception He has spared none from his severe satirical stings According to him our Mahābhārata is a tale of brothers killing brothers and of looseness of marriage institution (*hādara*), and those who respectfully attend to it degrade themselves

Haribhadra's attack, in the Dhūrtākhyāna is directed against such legends found in the epics and Purānas His conclusion is threefold the popular scriptures, when one scrutinizingly studies them, are found to contain worthless stuff that looks smooth only from outside (V 120), the legends narrated in them do not stand the test of rational scrutiny and are unacceptable like artificial gold (V 119), and the pious, who believed in them so far, should abandon them and follow the path of Sarvajña (V 121) Indirectly, but inevitably, these works being religious scriptures, the entire Purānic religion and its followers are being exposed to criticism, the former for having contained such legends and the latter for their acceptance of the same

Logical polemics and witty criticism are the two recognised modes of attack, their ultimate purpose is to knock down the opponent, but their ways and intermediate tactics are different, and the weapons in their armouries and their movements on the field are dissimilar The former necessarily requires an elaborate and systematic seige and a trained audience to pronounce the judgement, while the latter needs alert wit and adroit movements If one is a trenched battle, the other is a guerilla warfare The success of the former leaves behind acrimony that might involve endless attacks and counter attacks, but that of the latter wounds the opponent without leaving a scar and pricks him without bleeding Logicians can be trained for the purpose, but a witty critic is an artist by birth

Haribhadra is an eminent logician, no doubt, but, in this work, on the whole, we see him more as a witty critic assailing the citadel of Purānic legends The plot of the work is simple It is a story of five rogues each of whom recounts an impossible, fantastical experience which is confirmed to be true by one or the other colleague after quoting parallels from the Mahābhārata, Rāmāyana, etc In the last chapter this mode of presentation is slightly modified It is their female accomplice that narrates her experiences, and the remaining take their respective chances to confirm the same by Purānic parallels She narrates her biography, and suddenly puts them on the horns of a dilemma if they accept her statement, they have to submit to her as slaves, and if they refuse, they have to give a feast to the whole gathering They find that they are outwitted, her superiority is accepted, she trickily extracts wealth from a merchant by charging him with the murder of her child, and all the rogues get a grand feast from her To this plot, which is mainly made up of conversation with casual descriptions, there is a Preamble (I 1-16) which introduces the rogues, their stipulation and their agreement, besides the opening *mangala*, and there is also a Conclusion (V 111 f) which summarily denounces some of the legends, besides giving the author's conclusion, aim and personal details

The improbable and fantastic tales narrated by the rogues as a part of their experience, are consistent and compact units Even the elements of exaggeration are quit in keeping with medieval tales If they were not followed by any legendary confirmation, they could be easily passed off as amusing and adventurous tales, quite innocent in their constitution

But when the author holds them up side by side with the Purānic legends, their sarcastic potency becomes at once apparent The tales by themselves speak highly for the skilful inventiveness of Haribhadra As they stand, I think, they are composed by Haribhadra himself, keeping in view the Purānic legends to be denounced The stories thus are his creation, but quite well-known in Indian literature are some of their motifs namely, a wild elephant pursuing a traveller, people holding a fair in honour of a Yakṣa, a robber-party attacking a caravan, an ambitious youth pursuing the mirage of metallic transmutation by procuring some juice from an inaccessible pond, etc It is the use of these motifs that at once lends a popular air and a sort of reality to the tales of rogues The first four stories illustrate the author's ingenuity as also the richness of his imagination, whereas the story of Khandapānā shows his wit and fund of worldly wisdom

Haribhadra has a special fascination for popular stories of humorous and satirical style Some of them in Prākrit he quotes in his commentary on the Dasavaikālikasūtra[1] In one we have a group of Kārpatikas, they begin narrating their fantastical experiences, but a rational Śrāvaka tries to expose the weakness in the narration[2] In another context he quotes a fine dilemmatic short story which reminds us of the dilemma of Khandapānā[3] In a certain town there was a Parivrājaka who roamed about with a golden bowl declaring that he would give it to one who narrated to him an unheard event A Śrāvaka addressed him thus, 'Your father owed to my father one hundred thousand coins if you know this already, please return the amount, but if you do not know it, please give the golden bowl as declared by you' He also quotes a fine satirical verse in Sanskrit, possibly summarising some earlier conversation in Prākrit, made up of questions and answers It is said to be put in the mouth of a Dhūrta and addressed to a Buddhist monk who had a net-like garment on his person The verse may be freely rendered thus[4] 'Sir, why is your garment

[1] Śri Daśavaikālikasūtram with Haribhadra's commentary, Bombay 1918, pp 54, 56 f

[2] एगम्मि देवकुले कप्पडिया मिलिया भणंति । केण भे भमंतेहिं किंचि अच्छेरियं दिट्ठं । तत्थ एगो कप्पडिगो भणइ । मए दिट्ठं ति । जइ पुण एत्थ समणोवासओ नत्थि तो साहेमि । तओ सेसेहिं भणियं । णत्थित्थ समणोवासओ । पच्छा सो भण । मए हिंडंतेणं पुव्ववेयालीए समुद्दस्स तडे रुक्खो महइमहंतो दिट्ठो । तस्सेगा साहा समुद्दे पइट्ठिया एगा य थले । तत्थ जाणि पत्ताणि जले पडंति ताणि जलचराणि सत्ताणि हवंति । जाणि थले ताणि थलचराणि हवंति । ते कप्पडिया भणंति । अहो अच्छेरयं देवेण भट्टारएण णिम्मियं ति । तत्थेगो सावगो कप्पडिओ । सो जाणि अद्धमज्झे पडंति ताणि किं हवंति । ताहे सो खुद्धो भणइ । मया पुव्वं चेव भणियं । जइ सावओ नत्थि तो कहेमि । Pp 54-5

[3] एगम्मि नगरे एगो परिव्वायगो सोवण्णएण खोरएण तहिं हिंडइ । सो भणइ । जो मम असुयं सुणावेइ तस्स एयं देमि खोरयं । तत्थ एगो सावगो । तेण भणियं । तुज्झ पिया मम पिउणो धारेइ अणूणयं सयसहस्स । जइ सुयपुव्वं दिज्जउ अह न सुयं खोरयं देहि ।

[4] किल कोइ तच्चणिओ (=बौद्ध) जालवावडकरो मच्छगवहाए चलिओ । धुत्तेण भण्णइ । आयरिय अघणा ते कंथा । सो भणइ । जालमेतमित्यादि श्लोकादवसेयम् । 'कन्थाचार्याघना ते' ननु शफरवधे जालम्, अश्नासि मत्स्यान्, ते मे मद्योपदंशान्, पिबसि, ननु युतो वेश्यया, यासि वेश्याम् । कृत्वारीणां गलेऽङ्घ्री, क्व नु तव रिपवो, येषु सधिं छिनद्मि, चौरस्त्व, द्यूतहेतो, कितव इति कथं, येन, दासीसुतोऽस्मि ॥' इदं लौकिकम् etc p 54

thread-bare? Well, it is for netting fish Do you eat fish? I take them when excited by wine Do you drink wine? When I mate with a hetaera Do you visit a prostitute? After kicking on the necks of my enemies Whence have you enemies? Those whose houses I have broken into Are you a burglar? Just for the purpose of gambling Are you a Rogue? Because I am a slave-girl's son' These illustrate Haribhadra's acquaintance with and aptitude for humorous and satirical folktales

Haribhadra is an adept story-teller If we casually glance through his Samarāiccakahā, we find that he is well-informed about the workings of human mind and about the human behaviour in general His experience is wide, naturally he creates characters and situations of engrossing interest The Samarāiccakahā[1] gives many counter tales which go to confirm the central idea of the main story He possesses a special liking for symbolical epilogues, apparently meaningless, but full of significance and instruction when they are explained Enlightenment by absurd stories and situations is a fine weapon which Haribhadra brandishes quite successfully Arhaddatta (Sixth Bhava), for instance, was enlightened when he was incurably attached to the pleasures of body by telling him that he was as foolish as a person extinguishing fire with grass Absurd situations are presented illustrating such motifs Similar tendencies are seen in the Dhū as well The fantastic tales expose the absurdity of Purānic legends, and thus enlighten and correct those that put faith in the Purānic religion

It is the agreement of rogues that supplies a graceful bracket for the projection of the plot Lest he would be required to give the stipulated feast, every rogue is anxious to confirm the fantastic stories by quoting similar Purānic legends It is in the fitness of things that every rogue should be given the chance of confirming the experience of their female companion, otherwise, if only one were to be given this chance, there would arise some jealousy and others would not have the opportunity of being chivalrous It is not the story as a whole, but just some of the convenient points of it that are selected for confirmation with one or more similar legends and episodes from the epics and Purāṇas The legends get automatically ridiculed, because they are closely parallel to the incidents or points in the fantastic story As the rogues go on attempting to prove the impossible with the aid of Purānic legends, the legends themselves get ridiculed Thus, to a certain extent, the author is using the mode of *reductio ad absurdum* in denouncing the legends

All of them are confirmed rogues, quite expert in their business, and it is not without some significance that they should be made to dabble in Purānic legends, as if this was quite on par with their usual routine! It looks like a bit of irony that the legends should be put in the mouth of rogues and that they should come forth to prove the impossible by quoting them! Ākhyāna is usually a serious tale, especially an epical or Purānic episode It is certainly a piece of pungent sarcasm, if Ākhyāna refers here (V 6) to the fantastic tales narrated by rogues If it refers to the series of Purānic legends and episodes, it is equally ironical that they should be put in the mouth of rogues and that both of them should prominently figure in the title of the book! Thus the plot, the mode and accessories of attack and even the title all these are not only appropriate but also partial and favourable for the artistic performance which Haribhadra has achieved here Even minor touches add to the ironical flavour of the atmosphere Mūladeva declares that he is putting up with *parisaha* such as hunger and thirst (I 28), a veritable Jaina monk indeed!, Kandarīka

[1] Ed H Jacobi, B I, No 169, Calcutta 1926

salutes the feet of Jina like a pious devotee (II 24), Khamdavānā qualifies herself as *aṭṭhārasa-dosavivajjiyā* (V 98), an adjective usually applied to the Tīrthakara, and lastly, that hypocritically exacted tip is glorified as a Dāna, a pious donation, which renders everything allright (V 102) There are some drawbacks sometimes the same legends and motifs are repeated and in some places there is some obscenity As to the first one wished that the author avoided this repetition, but as to the second, it was inevitable, if the author wanted to expose the obscenity of some of the Purānic legends

By assimilating different traditions Western literature has come to possess an astonishing variety of literary expression The fact becomes obvious even to a superficial student of English literature, if he simply notes its chief landmarks and growth Scholars comparing the ancient Indian literature with that of the English are struck with the manifold variety, range and artistic appeal in the latter The disparity can be explained away on the basis of the peculiar lines on which each civilization advanced Apart from its intrinsic merits and abiding values, in a way, by taking into account the range of time covered by the civilization, the extent of the land and the magnitude of the population, one has to admit that the ancient Indian literature, available to us today, is comparatively small in quantity and limited in variety The reasons are apparent On the whole, the Indian mind has enjoyed the comfort of dignified isolation from constant foreign influence Religious spirit has permeated not only Indian life, but also Indian literature even secular compositions could not escape religio-moral influence Both men of letters and literary life in India are confined, as a rule, to an insignificant minority of hereditory intellectual aristocrats Antiquity is an asset, but not necessarily a virtue Old turns of expression and moulds of thought got stereotyped, and as conventions they had a metallic grip on ancient Indian literature Even the training of an Indian poet or author is of a standardised cast the aims are settled, the themes are dictated, type-characters are supplied, and even ready-made descriptions and stylistic devices are kept at the disposal of an author in the making Ordinary intellect got crippled, though sufficiently trained, it is only the extraordinary genius that attempted to open new literary paths somewhat deviating from the accepted standards In isolated branches of literature, the Indian mind exhibits remarkable elevation, successful finish and consummate polish, but the lack of variety is apparent everywhere The fact that ancient India, which could boast of the greatest masterpieces in epic poetry and certain kinds of fiction and drama, has neither a tragedy after the manner of the Greeks nor satire in Roman fashion is to be attributed to the peculiar way in which the Indian mind evolved and the Indian author was trained for his job The Sanskrit or even Indian 'poetic theory of super-individual emotion and its complacent attitude towards life', as Dr De remarks, 'precluded any serious cultivation of the satiric type of literature'

Satire as a form of literature has been conspicuously absent in early Indian literature India, however, has not been lacking in literary geniuses that were trained according to standard discipline Every age has its follies and faults, and these geniuses, on account of their righteous indignation and as a wholesome correction, must have brandished their satirical whip against social disorders and diseases Such satirical compositions could not have the same sanctity as that enjoyed by religious works, and it is not unlikely that many specimens have not come down to us, even if the art of satire was duly cultivated Satire, moreover, is an indispensable stylistic quality in some forms of literature, and the elements of this quality are found scattered, here and there, in early Indian literature in stories, in minor poems and in plays

The Daśakumāracarita, on account of its setting, substance, characters and events, is far from possessing the stereotyped orthodox outlook in fact, it is a remarkable contribution of a novel type in Sanskrit It presents a lively and realistic picture of the society, some glimpses of which we get in the Mrcchakatikam Dandin is unconventional by temperament Though it is not his aim to give his composition the form of a satire, he has easily meted out some satirical lashes against gods who are dragged down to illustrate the disgraceful deeds of the characters (pp 29, 44), against Brāhmanas who are greedy for wealth and divert themselves by cock-fighting (p 96), against hypocritical ascetics whose passion is easily enkindled (p 44 f), against the Digambara Jaina monk who is made to confess the worthlessness of his mode of life (p 47 f), and against Buddhist nuns who are ridiculed as go-betweens The adventurous tales of young princes have an enchanting grip on the readers mind, and Dandin's tendency to ridicule certain aspects of the society by satire and caricature, quietly but effectively, is apparent in various places[1] In this context attention may be drawn to the Bharataka-Dvātrimśikā[2], a late work of the fourteenth century A D , in popular Sanskrit The term *bharataka* means a kind of Śaiva monks, and this collection of thirty-two tales is designed for purposes of exposing the *mūrkha-jana-carita* so that one might understand *sadācarana* The Śaiva monks are satirized by means of stories illustrating their moral depravity and stupidity The *bharataka* is made to quote the parallels of gods and saints to justify his behaviour, thus ridiculing the gods and saints as well with himself Some of the stories exhibit a good fund of worldly wisdom, wit and humour

Somehow the element of satire seen in poems and play is not of a very high order the art of satirising becomes bald abuse and coarse ridicule, if it does not leave behind a healthy and correcting influence The Kuttinīmata of Dāmodaragupta (*c* 779-813 A D) is more erotico-comic than satiric[3] Another polymath who has studiously worked in this line is Ksemendra, of the middle of the eleventh century A D Some of his works deserve special attention in this context His Samayamātrkā deals with the traditional erotic topics It presents varied pictures of the society, and the situations are sketched in a pointed style 'The merit of the work lies not in its unsavoury story, but in its heightened, yet graphic, picture of droll-life, painted with considerable sharpness of phrasing and characterisation, and with an undertone of mocking satire directed against many forms of prevalent deformity' His Darpadalana is equally interesting His salutation to *viveka* in the opening Mangala is quite significant In seven sections it demonstrates the folly of pride based on *kula*, *dhana*, *vidyā*, *rūpa*, *śaurya*, *dāna* and *tapas* Besides the gnomic verses on each, they are illustrated with tales invented for the purpose The form is interesting More than once the author drags the Purāṇic deities and personalities on a lower plain by citing how they have not been immune from these flaws (I 17 f , III 79 f , IV 18 f , etc) The moral tone is quite predominant, and the attack on holiness, though casual, is sufficiently pungent His Kalāvilāsa is a satirical discourse in ten sections, put in a legendary setting The first chapter lashes the roguish hyprocrisy, *dambha*, seen in different walks of life, found not only among men and women of different classes but also among birds and

[1] Daśakumāracarita of Daṇḍin, Revised in one vol by G J Agashe, 2nd ed , Bombay Sk and Pk Series, Bombay 1919, Keith A History of Sanskrit Literature, Oxford 1928, pp 296 f , S K De The Prose Kāvyas of Daṇḍin, Subandhu and Bāṇa, Festscript Prof Kane, pp 112-44, Poona 1941

[2] Ed J Hertel, Leipzig 1921

[3] Keith A History of Sk Literature, pp 236 f , S K De Some Satiric Poems in Sanskrit, Indian Culture, Vol VIII, No 1, pp 1-8

vegetables He is harsh on Gaudas, and now and then even sacred deities and sages are not spared The remaining chapters deal with greed, erotic impulse, harlot, Kāyastha, pride, etc His scourges on the greedy merchant, quack doctor, pretending astrologer, crooked Kāyastha, etc, are bitter and wounding This 'work is thus a remarkable and comprehensive discourse, with a legendary framework, on the various activities of notorious tricksters known to Ksemendra, and his easy and elegant style makes the descriptions amusing and the satire effective' As observed by Dr De, Ksemendra's compositions are 'noteworthy satirical sketches exaggerated *cum grano salis* but substantially faithful, having less frequent lapses into squalor or coarseness, and composed in the best literary manner of Ksemendra There is nothing of melancholy wisdom in Ksemendra Knowing full well the castigating use of satire, he deals out his blows too liberally, but with precision, with bitter and often foul-mouthed presumption, but with the unerring, insight of a shrewd observer' Ksemendra's satirical writings assume all the more importance, because his successors like Jahlana, Nīlakantha Dīksita, etc, never rose to his heights They are all steeped in the time-honoured mould of religious didacticism and hackneyed eroticism 'Anxious to maintain respectability, they are afraid of descending to the repellent reality which their subject demands, and only touch the fringe of it, from a safe distance, with the stick of romantic verse'

Among the plays, it is the Bhāna and the Prahasana types[1] that contain a great deal of satirical element Bhāna is a monologue play, the only character is a Vita or Dhūrta who narrates, with imaginary questions and answers and with various gestures, either his experience or that of others Most of the existing specimens of *bhānas* are comparatively modern and belong to the South, they lack variety and are of the same pattern, almost made to order, and they are predominantly permeated with erotic sentiment, very often coarse in taste There is very little of genuine satire in them, we get, however, satirical touches in the descriptions 'of the licentious Paurānika, the old Śrotriya, the fraudulent astrologer and (but this rarely) the Jangamas, Śaivas and Vaisnavas (as in the Śrngāratilaka)' The Hāsyacūdāmani of Vatsarāja ridicules the Bhāgavatas, while the Mukundānanda pours a great deal of pungent satire against the Gurjara people Such satirical touches are almost thrown into background by their mechanichal characters, the roguish parasites and the haterea and by excessive eroticism The four Bhānas, which are edited as Caturbhānī[2] and which definitely belong to an earlier age, present 'more variety, greater simplicity, a larger amount of social satire and comic relief, a more convincing power of drawing individuals rather than types, easier and more colloquial style, and some measure of real poetry in spite of certain coarseness' In the Padmaprābhrtaka, the Vita, Śaśa by name, a friend of Karnīputra Mūladeva (both of them of Ujjainī), gets a specified individuality The racy speeches of the Vita, in the Pādatāditaka, are remarkably satirical, his ridicule is abundantly directed against the Lātas and the Buddhist order, and the Dāserakas, Saurāstras and Mālavas are not spared from casual hits These Bhānas are often obscene, if not vulgar, and the primal sensations are portrayed with a rough realism and terrible sincerity For a student of literature, as Dr De rightly remarks, 'it is more than useless to read austere morals into these old-time play-wrights or damn them for want of morals'

[1] I have derived much help from two important papers by Dr S K De A Note on the Sanskrit Monologue-Play (Bhāṇa) with Special Reference to the Caturbhāṇī, JRAS, 1926, pp 63-90, and The Sanskrit Prahasana, The Poona Orientalist, VII, 3-4, pp 149-56

[2] Caturbhāṇī, ed by Kavi and Sastri, Patna 1922

Turning to the Prahasana, the popular farce, there is ample scope for social satire in it by the very nature of its subject-matter, but the specimens that have survived are far from being satisfactory Their wit and humour, which would make one laugh, lie in deliberately vulgar exhibitions and expressions in short, the whole atmosphere in the Prahasana, on account of conventional characters and incidents and the high-strung erotic sentiment, is low and depressing The Mattavilāsa of Mahendravikrama (7th Century A D) is a slight farcical sketch depicting the drunken and passionate revelry of a Śaiva mendicant, calling himself a Kapālin on account of the human skull carried by him in lieu of his alms-bowl which is said to be stolen by a hypocritical Buddhist monk A degenerate Pāśupata comes to settle the case of theft, and finally the missing bowl is obtained from a madman who had retrieved it from a dog Thus the wreckless wrangling in the monastic order is broadly satirised The Prahasanas like Lataka-melaka, Dhūrtasamāgama, etc, have much to do with rogues and knaves, the Jaina and Buddhist monks are held in ridicule, but with their symbolic characters, whatever little wit and satire they possess is often defaced by open vulgarity and erotic descriptions Stray satirical verses in Sanskrit and Prākrit may be collected from anthologies and from illustrations on the rhetorical device called *vyāja-stuti*, but they cannot, being isolated verses, exhibit any sustained style as such Thus this survey leaves us cold that early Indian literature has not achieved much in the field of satire

Haribhadra is a genius by birth and a satirist by temperament He has bequeathed to posterity a valuable contribution to Indian literature through his Dhūrtākhyāna which is unique in various respects We might try to assess its value, as a work of art, from the point of view of a modern critic of letters The terminology of English criticism[1] cannot be literally applied to Indian works, because the terms have sometimes specified associations and import The Dhū apparently looks like a parody inasmuch as it ridicules by imitation, but if we go into details we find that it cannot be called a parody for various reasons no work or class of works is *continuously* ridiculed through word-, form- or sense-rendering, secondly, the imaginary tales narrated by rogues do not easily remind us of any one story or of any work or class of works, thirdly, the legends that are ridiculed do not come serially or at random from any one composition, but they are heaped from different sources to hold in ridicule their common motif something like what is already noted in the invented tale, and lastly, there is no deliberate attempt on the part of the author to confound issues by distortion or exaggeration of facts The Dhūrtākhyāna, therefore, can be better and more appropriately called a satire of incredible Purānic legends and episodes and against the credulity of those that believe them, using parodical imitation as its chief vehicle and casually taking recourse to irony, sarcasm, banter, wit and humour. It is a satire, and a perfect one, because of its unique construction, a delicious mingling of phantasy and reality, subtle sense of characterization (though in a limited quantity) and above all the startling situation of devils discussing scriptures which make it an inimitable piece of raillery and a good humoured amusement for all Haribhadra possesses a righteous indignation which is passionate, noble and fearless Like a true satirist, he thoroughly ridicules rather objectively, in his Sambodha-prakarana,[2] the vices that had perhaps crept into the Jaina monastic order of his times he detests, pities and condemns the vices and the

[1] See the articles on Parody by Christopher Stone and on Satire by Gilbert Cannan in The Art and Craft of Letters Series See also English Satires, in the Casket Library Series, especially the Introduction

[2] Ed Jaina Grantha Prakāśaka Sabhā, Ahmedabad 1916, especially Gurvādhikāra

irreligious routine of the ascetic life, while in the Dhū he satirizes the folly of the degenerating belief of the masses in Purāṇic legends Monks are morally and religiously degraded, and the public is on the verge of rational bankruptcy, and here Haribhadra comes like an expert surgeon to ply his satirical instrument, before he can put the bandage of religious and didactic teaching Like Voltaire, Haribhadra was out to cure, and he had a panacea, Reason Haribhadra is a champion of rational and logical attitude, he declares in one place [1] 'I am not partial to *Mahāvīra*, nor do I bear any ill will against Kapila and others, whose words appeal to reason, his mission is to be upheld' He has given vent to this spirit more than once The good satirist, we know, holds a place half-way between preacher and the wit He has the purpose of the first and uses the weapons of the second He must both hate and love For what impels him to write is not less the hatred of error and folly than the love of right and wise vision The satirist's appeal is always to the intellect, and rarely does he play upon the emotions His is a perfectly rational attitude strengthened by the nicest sense of proportion Like a rationlist, Haribhadra's approach is intellectual, apart from his being a champion of logic and reason, but his still greater asset is the mental poise with which he meets his opponents He is not a logician infuriated with religious fanaticism, but he is a genuine rationalist of a balanced mind, and to a certain extent we see this even in the Dhūrtākhyāna As a genius Haribhadra has at his back a fund of good logic Quite skilfully and humorously, like a creative artist, he applies it to the incredible Purānic ideas which have a sway over men's minds, the invented tales are full of logical extremes and absurdities, and when the Purānic legends are set on par with them, they cannot but be ridiculous and absurd The minds that start doubting the veracity of invented tales are easily led to denounce the Purānic legends With untiring assiduity he scrutinizes, sorts and shifts the Purānic legends according to their points of weakness, and pours them forth to substantiate the most ridiculous extremes and distortions with the resul that not only the purpose of proving the unprovable fails but the Purānic legends themselves get ridiculed as improbable and absurd The result is startling, though inevitable He satirizes the legends rather by exposing them by selection and comparing them with ridiculously fantastic tales than by vehemently denouncing them As we see below, Haribhadra exhibits a remarkable intellectual honesty, so far as the main motifs are concerned, he does not tamper with the Purānic legends he does not distort them to ridicule them

"The true end of satire is the amendment of vices by correction', says Dryden, and he is perfectly right in hitting at the end and aim of all great satires so emphatically Haribhadra has undoubtedly a religio-moral purpose, hinted rather than elaborated (V 122, 124), in writing this Ākhyāna As has been observed, the polished raillery and the good natured satire have an ethical under-current, otherwise 'the satire which only seeks to wound is as dangerous as arrows that fly in the dark' It must be said to Haribhadra's credit that the satirical artist in him has successfully, and also rightly, predominated over the religious preacher in him 'No artist can do more than set his practised a d controlled talent to work on the subject chosen and constantly developed for him by the inspiration of his

[1] In his Lokatattva-nirṇaya 'पक्षपातो न मे वीरे न द्वेषः कपिलादिषु । युक्तिमद्वचनं यस्य तस्य कार्य. परिग्रह ॥' and in his Yogabindu 'आग्रही बत निनीषति युक्तिं तत्र यत्र मतिरस्य निविष्टा । पक्षपातरहितस्य तु युक्तियत्र तत्र मतिरेति निवेशम् ॥'

genius' Our author just exercises his imagination in the way laid down for him by his characters and circumstances, and one feels that even if he had stopped his work at V 109 (of course followed by V 119-24), nothing fundamental would have been missed Nowhere does he show the temptation of preaching moral lessons like a professional religious teacher Any other mediocre author would have introduced a Kevalin at the end to give a *dhamma-kahā* whereby all the rogues would be turned into pious believers who would ultimately reach liberation after observing *samlehanā* Haribhadra has fully and rightly restrained himself from adding to his composition any such conclusion so usual and normal in Jaina tales The Dhūrtākhyāna, therefore, has a literary form, nothing specially religious about it, it is an out-and-out satire, an artist's creation, and as a literary product, it is far ahead of its time In fact, coming so early as in the 8th century A D, Dhū reveals such an artistry and management of the material as one can simply marvel at Not even the works of Kṣemendra, who does possess a satirical skill and whose performance we have reviewed above, can match the Dhūrtākhyāna, which is nearly three hundred years older than him, with regard to construction and subtle satirical effect Haribhadra is throughout an artist, while Ksemendra's satire is overladen with and defaced by heavy didacticism If one understands our author's *bhava-viraha* as an escape from the tedium of life, Haribhadrasūri will have the credit of hitting at an accepted standard of the greatness of satire in modern times

The characters introduced by Haribhadra are not altogether imaginary, but, in fact, most of them are well-known figures in Indian popular tale and picaresque literature Mūlaśrī or Mūladeva[1] is a famous character as a Jack of all trades given to gambling and attached to courtezan Devadattā It appears that he had alternative names such as Karnīsuta, Mūlabhadra and Kalānkura Even a treatise on theft or erotics is attributed to him by tradition Certainly he is an old figure Haribhadra himself quotes a Prākrit story in his commentary on the Daśavaikālika-sūtra (p 57 f) in which Mūladeva figures as a tricky rogue The Avantisundarīkathā (verse 7) mentions him, Bāna also, in his Kādambarī, refers to him with his friend Śaśa, and both of them are introduced (with Devadattā) in the Padmaprābhrtaka He figures as a typical hero in the Kalāvilāsa of Ksemendra The Kathāsritsāgara also gives his story, and he is associated with the court of Vikramāditya We get a Jaina edition of the tale of Mūladeva and Devadattā quoted in Devendra's commentary on the Uttarādhyayana[2] Thus Mūladeva appears to have reached the status of a popular hero typifying all that is tricky and roguish The name Kamdarīya is met with in the Ardhamāgadhī canon[3], he is not a rogue, but a worldly-comfort-seeking character destined to go to hell Jaina stories mention names like Ilāputra and Āsādhabhūti, and according to the Abhidhāna-Rājendra, Elāsādha is a famous rogue from Avanti referred to in the Niśītha-cūrnī[4] Śaśa, as noted above, appears to have been a close associate of Mūladeva We do not know anything about Khamdavānā from other sources her name

[1] On Mūladeva see Dr De's paper on the Bhāṇa, JRAS, 1926, Avantisundarīkathā, Madras 1924, Kāvyamālā I, p 36, foot-note 1, Caturbhāṇī, Intro p iii, Mūladeva's story from Devendra's commentary on the Uttarādhyayana is edited by Jacobi in his Ausgewählte Erzählugen in Māhārāṣṭri Leipzig 1886, its English translation 'Hindu Tales' by Meyer, London 1909, also Prākṛtakathāsamgraha by Jinavijayaji, Ahmedabad A paper 'The Character and Adventure of Mūladeva' by M Bloomfield has appeared in the Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol 52, 1913, pp 616-650, but it has not been accessible to me

[2] Śrī-Uttarādhyayanāni, Bombay 1927

[3] Nāyādhammakahāo, I, 19

[4] This work is not accessible to me, and it is necessary to see what details are given by the Cūrṇī

has a popular ring and baffles Sanskritic etymology Though most of the characters are already known, there is very little of characterization in the Dhūrtākhyāna It is only Khaṇḍapāṇā, with her coarseness and sharp intellect, that is a bit individualized. She is a good combination of a woman and a rogue She is intelligent, hypocritical, scheming and witty, her success in getting the wealth from the merchant is quite worthy of her nature and trade, without any difference of opinion she becomes the President of Rogues; and she smashes the vanity and satisfies the appetite of her colleagues by a well-earned and sumptuous feast One wishes that Haribhadra spent more labour and greater insight in making the characters and stories more individualistic as has been done by Chaucer in his immortal Canterbury Tales

The literary device of picaros narrating their experience with a satirical vein is seen to a certain extent in the Daśakumāracarita and in the Bhāna type of dramas, but the manner in which and the purpose for which Haribhadra has adopted it is remarkable We know some of his successors like Amitagati etc, but we are absolutely in the dark about his predecessors in the field The form, however, is dramatic in which characters are made to speak, Haribhadra tells us that it was narrated as a tale (V 123), and not enacted as a play, but with minor changes the whole piece can be turned into a fine Prahasana of open satire

The most astonishing thing about the Dhūrtākhyāna is not that it is satirical, nor that it is one of the rare pieces of the kind in early Indian literature, but that it should be so thoroughly modern both in thought and spirit, and such a master-piece of construction Most of the Roman or the English satire is cast in the mould of a dream or an allegory This makes it stilted and artificial It is only in Chaucer's Canterbury Tales and Boccacio's Decameron that an ingenious frame-work is used to impart an air of reality to the narration The device of emboxing stories within a story is a common trait in most of the Indian sagas Apart from this consideration, the frame-work of the Dhūrtākhyāna is certainly one of its notable features The rogue-chiefs, each telling a fantastic story of his own and asking others to prove its truth or to accept defeat and give feast to rest of them, as they were all hungry during the rainy week and had run thither into the garden in order to manage to get food, afford the satire an amusing yet natural setting The truth of their wonderful and wild stories is immediately proved by parallels from the Bhārata, Rāmāyana and Purānas The last chief who is a female recounts a number of autobiographical incidents which are likewise regarded as credible But then, all this still keeps the main problem unsolved! How are they to get food for themselves and for their retinue? Their female accomplice proposes that she would give them a feast only if they acknowledged her supremacy This they would never accept She then, continuing her narration, leads it to such a point that they have to recognize her suzerainty or give feast Thus the woman is triumphant, and her wit and wisdom enable them all to satisfy their most immediate need of food The impossible yarns concocted by the Rogues, the replies thereto, and above all the witty and surprising end of the story reveal its architectonic skill and the beauty of design The Dhūrtākhyāna has a unity and compactness that can be distinctly felt, and except for the one or two obscene references and blunt outspokenness and crudity of Khandapānā's experience, there is nothing superfluous or inartistic in the satire Besides, its perfectly original structure is one of its highest distinctions, and sufficient by itself to proclaim the author's genius

In speaking of the unity of the Dhūrtākyāna it was the organic unity, therefore unity of form and spirit both, that was hinted at Even though there is an indirect reference

in favour of Jainism at the close of the work (V 121-22), the satire as a whole is general, directed against credulity and superstition that deaden man's reasoning faculties and lead him away from the path of Truth. According to accepted critical standards, it is modern and not medieval, and it is more Horacian than Juvenalian It is throughout rational and convincing It shall be as well called good-humoured, as there is no deliberate attempt to distort or exaggerate facts or indulge in repeated rancour. The main point is that we should not be foolishly credulous and accept the mythological stories as literally true As seen below, almost all the references to Purāṇas, etc, are traceable to their origins The author is always implicit, and never vituperative in his criticism, and makes an intelligent use of dilemma, not only to prove or disprove things but also to give a witty air to everything that is ridiculed Khandapānā's cornering and outwitting her male accomplices is a brilliant example of this device The use of such dilemmatic situations has given a logical tone (quite inevitable and essential in the work of an outstanding logician like Haribhadra) and balance to the narration Except for a few repetitions (elephant-pursuit, mating with Sun, Wind etc), the story has the fullest variety with its strange, mysterious, awe-inspiring and terrible phantasies set in a realistic background and provided with a rollicking humorous close Some of the descriptions, short or long, for instance that of the cemetery, are quite epical in style and make-up The story element in the frame-work is comparatively slight, but has gained a remarkable poise because of Khandapānā's flashing victories over her partners and the banker whom she dupes by her superior intelligence and womanly wiles

The precocious genius of the author[1], obvious in this unique work, indeed, provides a delightful field for researches in literary developments, and it is hoped that the publication of this edition of Dhūrtākhyāna will inspire others to unearth still richer treasures that lie buried in the literature of ancient India

4 Sources of the Purānic Legends

Throughout the Dhū, in order to confirm the fantastic tale narrated by one Dhūrta, other Dhūrtas have presented a series of Epic and Purānic legends It is necessary to study them, wherever possible, in comparison with the legends as preserved in present-day texts Haribhadra is not very particular in mentioning his sources, specifying the work and its author Usually he refers to them in general terms like Śruti, Purāṇa etc (I 14, 31, 35, 53, 89, II 27, 51, III 20, 53, 88, IV 15, 27, V 11, 64), Bhārata[2] and Rāmāyana, however, are repeatedly mentioned (I 14, 31, 35, 41, 82, 85, II 27, 62, III 20, 93, IV 14, 15, 19, V 60, 119), and there are single references to Viṣnupurāṇa and

[1] Most of the works of Haribhadra are yet to be studied critically The following are the chief sources where some points about this life, works and date are discus ed H T Sheth Haribhadrasūri-caritram (in Sanskrit), Benares 1917 Śrī Kalyāṇavijayaji Introduction (in Sanskrit) to the ed of Dharmasaṃgrahaṇiḥ, Devachandra L P Fund Series No 42, Bombay 1918 Jinavijayaji Haribhadrasūrikā Samayanirṇaya (in Hindi), Jaina Sāhitya Saṃśodhaka, Vol I, part 1, pp 21-58, also his 'The Date of Haribhadrasūri (in Sanskrit)', Poona 1919, his conclusion, based on sound proofs, is that Haribhadra should be assigned to A D 700-770 Becharadas Jivaraj Introduction to his Jaina Darśana (in Gujarāti), Ahmedabad Samvat 1980 H Jacobi Introduction (in English) to the ed of Samarāiccakahā, B I, Calcutta 1926, Jacobi accepts 750 A D or later as the time of Haribhadra's literary activity, in his account of Haribhadra's life, he has scrutinised the traditional biographies and given a connected narration K V Abhyankar Intro to his edition of the Vimsativimśikā, Poona

[2] Haribhadra uniformly mentions Bhārata and never Mahābhārata

Araṇya-parvan (of the Bhārata) and also to Vyāsa, the author of Bhārata (II 27, II 31; I 41) Once Arthaśāstra is casually mentioned (V 1) but not as a source In the following paragraphs are presented the Legends found in the Dhū, their sources traced by us, and critical remarks on the same in some cases

I *1* 37-38 FOUR VARNAS IN BRAHMAN'S BODY —Rgveda X 90 12, Mahābhārata, Āranyaka-parvan (critical ed), 187 13

I *2* 39-40 HARA'S MALE ORGAN —Vāyupurāna (Ānandāśrama ed, 1905), chap. 55 23-38 —Verse 26 mentions that they tried to measure its limits for one thousand years.

I *3* 41-51 BIRTH OF KĪCAKAS (Bhārata of Vyāsa) —(?) —Haribhadra specifically mentiones the Bhārata of Vyāsa as his source According to Mbh, Virātaparvan (critical ed), App I, p 313, passage No 19, Kekaya, a Sūta king, had from his wife Mālavī one hundred and six sons of whom Kīcaka was the most mighty and was appointed as the commander by the Virāta king This is all that we learn about their origin, and in this context the legendary details noted by Haribhadra are not found Kīcaka does mean a hollow bamboo

I *4* 52 GANGĀ FOILED IN HARA'S JAṬĀ —Rāmāyana (Nirnayasāgara ed 1921), Bālakānda, 43 9 —Haribhadra says *vāsa-sahassam*, while in the Rāmā, we have *samvatsara-ganān bahūn*

I *5* 53-7 BIRTH OF BRAHMAN —Mbh, Āranyaka-parvan (critical ed), App I, pp 1084-5, passage No 27, especially ll 13-30 —There is some verbal agreement with the Mbh passage, but in this context it is not mentioned that Brahman came out with Danda etc and that the lotus was stuck, as noted by Haribhadra According to the Vāyupurāna, chap 55 14, Brahman is equipped with Kamandalu

I *6* 58-84 (i) TILOTTAMĀ RUINS BRAHMAN'S AUSTERITIES[1] (ii) BIRTH OF DRONĀCĀRYA, (iii) BIRTH OF SVEDA- AND RAKTA-KUNDALIN, (iv) KARNA BORN THROUGH THE EAR (Bhārata) —(i) Mbh Ādi (critical ed) 201 ff and Matsyapurāna (Ānandāśrama ed 1907), Adhyā, 3 31 f, (ii) Mbh Ādi (critical ed), 57 89, 121 3-5, 154, 1-5, (iii) Padmapurāna (Ānandāśrama ed 1894), Srstikhanda, Adhyā 14, (iv) (?) - (i) According to Ādiparvan 201 ff, Visvakarman, at the instruction of Pitāmaha (203 10-17), created Tilottamā, a veritable mine of jewels of beauty, for the destruction of Sunda and Upasunda She was called Tilottamā, because she was made from small portion of every kind of gem Mahādeva developed four faces to look at her as she went round (203 23-25) According to the Matsyapurāna, however, Brahman created Śatarūpī out of his body, and to look at her, he developed four faces (in four directions) with a fifth on the head This temptation ruined his austerities (ii) Haribhadra attributes Drona's birth and Pasupati and Umā, but according to Mbh it is attributed to Bhāradvāja and Ghrtācī, the circumstances being similar (iii) Though the names noted by Haribhadra are not given, the Padmapurāna narrates a story quite similar to this in the context of the earlier births of Arjuna and Karna Brahman produced a man from the perspiration of his forehead According to the Padma, Visnu offered blood from his arm (iv) Karna is considered to be the *amśa* of the Sun by whom he was generated from Kuntī (Mbh Ādi, 57 82, 61 89), and his

[1] The legend is split up for referential convenience A story much similar to No 1, is found in the Bṛhat Kathākośa of Hariṣeṇa (Bombay 1943), chap 99

birth is described at length in the Ādi 104 But I do not find any reference to his being born from the ear The Mbh mentions, however, that he was born with the Kavaca

I *7*. 85-88 HANUMAT CROSSES THE OCEAN (Rāmāyana) —Rāmāyaṇa, Sundarakānda, Sarga 1, verses 27, 54, Sarga 2, verse 2, etc —The Rāmāyana gives a graphic description how Hanumat jumps (his long arms and the root *tṛ* being more than once mentioned) across the ocean The Sanskrit quotation put in the mouth of Hanumat I have not been able to spot in the Nirnayasāgara ed in this context

I *8* 89-92 HARA RECEIVES GANGĀ ON HIS HEAD —Rāmāyana, Bālakānda, Sargas 42, 43 (verse 3 f), Mbh Āranyaka , 108 9 f , see also the remarks on I *4* 52 above —Mbh simply describes how Gangā was received by Hara, and there is no reference to her vanity as in the Rāmāyaṇa

II *1* 27-30 PRIMORDIAL EGG (Visnupurāna[1]) —Visnupurāna, Wilson's Translation (London 1864), Book I, chap II, pp 39-40, Mbh Ādi (critical ed) 1 27 f , Matsyapurāṇa, 2 32 ff , Brahmapurāna (Ānandāśrama ed 1895), 1 40 f —This is described almost in every Purāna

II *2* 31-39 THE WHOLE UNIVERSE IN A CHILD'S STOMACH (Araṇyaparvan) — Mbh , Āranyakaparvan, 186 —The details closely agree with a few common words even According to our text, it is the Sage that calls the Boy, but in the Mbh the Boy calls the Sage asking him to take shelter in his stomach (verses 88-9) The Mbh says that Mārkandeya was in the stomach of that Boy only for *varsānām adhikam śatam* (verse 110), but according to Haribhadra *divvam vāsa-sahassam* The Boy is none other than Visnu-Krsna, as it is clear from the names like Śrīvatsadhārin, Pītavāsā, Puṇḍarīkāksa etc.

II *3* 40-41 KEŚAVA IN DEVAKĪ'S WOMB —Bhāgavata (Nirnayasāgara ed) 10 7 34-36, also the references on II *2* 31-39 above —When Yaśodā was feeding Krsṇa, she happened to see the whole universe in his mouth which he opened while yawning

II *4* 42-50 BRAHMAN AND KEŚAVA —Compare Vāyupurāna, Adhyā 24, see also the references on I *5* 53-7 —A legend somewhat corresponding to Haribhadra's version is found in the Vāyu Brahman once approached Nārāyana who was sleeping on the great serpent in the ocean and who had produced a dignified lotus out of his navel for his sport They do not recognise each other, and each one claims that he is the Ādikartā First Visṇu enters the stomach of Brahman and sees the whole universe there, but could not reach the end even after one thousand years, so he comes out of his mouth Then Brahman enters Visnu's stomach and experiences the same When Visnu closed the outlets of his body, Brahman assumed a subtle form, came out through the lotus stalk, and took his seat on the lotus There is some jealousy between the two, but it is quieted on Brahman being admitted as the *putra* of Viṣnu (verses 57-53) born from his navel-lotus

II *5* 51-61 THE MIGHTY BOW OF DRUPADA —Compare Mbh , Ādi (critical ed) 174 ff —The Ādi describes the bow as *dṛdham, anāyamyam* (176 9), *devadattam* (footnote p 716, No 1809*), *samhanopapannam* (178 15) Is it that Haribhadra's Mbh

[1] The Sanskrit Text (verse No 102) mentions Bhārata also along with Viṣṇupurāṇa

[2] The Sanskrit Text (verse 106) mentions Araṇyapatha, a Śāstra, but I feel no doubt that Haribhadra is referring to a Parvan of that name in the Mbh.

text read 178 13 as an adjective of *kārmukam* in verse 15? Then alone the bow can be possessed of Nāgas etc According to the Mbh, Krsna and Bhīma are present at the gathering but merely as spectators Śiśupāla is humiliated, as noted by Haribhadra (foot-note being perhaps a misreading), but the passage concerned is found only is S (Sasipālo p 725, No 1828*) and not included in the critical text

II *6* 62-74 HILL-LIKE JATĀYU (Rāmāyana)—Compare Rāmāyana, Aranyakāndā, 50-53—The opposition of Jatāyu when Rāvana carried Sītā, their mutual fight, Jatāyu wounded by the sword of Rāvana all these events are described in the Aranyakānda Further that dying Jatāyu gives all the details to Rāma, accompanied by Laksmana (Sarga 67), and dies in their presence They perform the last rites (Sarga 68) According to Haribhadra, Sītā blesses Jatāyu that he would get wings after meeting Rāma's messenger, Hanumat, in his search for Sītā, meets Jatāyu who gives him all the details about her and who gets back his wings after meeting him but I see no proper context for these in the present text of the Rāmāyana of Vālmīki Jatāyu is, however, qualified in the Rāmāyana as *parvata-śrngābhah* (50 2) The Mbh, Āranyaka (critical ed), 262-63, which gives this episode, describes Jatāyu thus *Jatāyur giri-gocarah* (262 41), *grdhram nihatam parvatopamam* (263 15)

III *1* 21-25 RENUKĀ REVIVED TO LIFE—Mbh, Āranyakaparvan (critical ed) 116—That the trees respected her chastity is not specifically mentioned in the Mbh The name of the king in the Mbh is Citraratha and not Asvāpahrta as given by Haribhadra

III *2* 26 CONSTITUTION OF JARĀSAMDHA—Mbh, Sabhāparvan (Madras 1932), Adhyāya 19 (verses 54-55), 20 (verses 1-7) His name is explained thus *Jarayā samdhito yasmāj Jarāsamdho bhavatvayam*

III *3* 27-37 SUNDA AND NISUNDA DESTROYED BY TILOTTAMĀ—Mbh, Ādi (critical ed), 201-4—Upasunda of the Mbh is called Nisunda by Haribhadra, perhaps it is a contamination with Nikumbha, the name of the father of Sunda and Upasunda According to Mbh, Tilottamā was created by Viśvakarman, at the instruction of Pitāmaha, by putting together all that was beautiful in the three worlds She was like Laksmī, and her body was a veritable mine of jewels (203 12-17) Haribhadra, however, says that she was created by taking bits from gods

III *4* 38-44 HANUMAT PIECED TOGETHER—Compare Rāmāyana, Kiskindhākānda, 66 8-28, also Uttara-, 35-36—Hanumat's life in his childhood is given in the Rāmāyana according to which it is Indra that wounded him, while he jumped at the Sun, on the left chin whereby he came to be known as Hanumān (66 24) The instruction of the mother that he should eat red fruits, her lamentation, smashing of his body by the Sun's kick, subsequent piecing together of the same, and the substitution of the chin all these events, though referred to by Haribhadra, are not mentioned in the Rāmāyana in the above contexts

III *5* 46-52 HANUMAT BRINGS WOUND-HEALING MEDICINE—Rāmāyana, Yuddahkāṇda, Sarga 101, also Sarga 74 (especially verse 70) and Sarga 50—The details noted by Haribhadra are practically covered by the above contexts in the Rāmāyana

III *6* 53-86 BIRTH OF MAHĀSENA—Compare Mbh, Āranyakaparvan (critical ed) 213-14, Brahmapurāna, Adhyā, 128 7-23, Matsyapurāna, chap 158 26f, Vāyu-

purāna, Chap 72—According to the Mbh, Svāhā, the daughter of Daksa, satisfied the passion of Agni by assuming the forms of the six wives of Saptarsis (excepting Arundhatī, whose form she could not assume) She received the semen in hand, and with a desire that she should not be seen, she flew taking the form of a Garudi The semen was dropped in a golden pot six times, and therein was born Mahāsena with six heads etc He is also called Rudra's son, Rudra being identified with Agni (218 27f) and Svāhā with Umā (220 9) According to the Brahma- and the Matsya-purāna, Agni assumes the form of a parrot and approaches Śambhū and Umā Agni drops semen in the Krttikās and Kārtika was thus born Haribhadra plainly says *devā gabbh'uvaghāyam vicimtamti*, but the Sanskrit and Gujarāti versions indicate that gods wanted from Śiva and Umā a son who would destroy Tārakāsura Something like the legend which Haribhadra has in view is found in the Vāyupurāṇa The text of Vāyupurāna admits a sad confusion of various myths about Mahāsena, but it clearly says that Indra did not want any issue to be born from Śamkara and Umā, so he sent Agni to them[1] The concluding details are slightly different Seeing that the semen had fallen out of her body, Umā forced Agni to hold it in his stomach, he later sought the help of Gangā who delivered in a Himālayan valley, and a mighty son was born

III *7* 87-88 SUN AND MOON ECLIPSED BY RĀHU'S HEAD —Mbh?, Ādi (critical ed), 17 4-8—The corresponding story in the Mbh runs thus The Sun and Moon reported to Visnu that Rāhu, under the guise of a god, was just drinking nectar churned from the ocean Visnu immediately cut his head which began eclipsing the Sun and Moon with enmity towards them

III *8* 89-91 VISNU COVERS THE UNIVERSE BY THREE STEPS —Mbh, Āranyaka-parvan (critical ed), p 1086, App I, extract No 27, lines 66-81

III *9* 92 HANUMAT CARRIES THE DRONA MOUNTAIN WITH ALL ITS VEGETATION (Rāmāyana) —Rāmāyana, Yuddhakānda, Sarga 101 30-46, see also Sargas 50 and 74

III *10* 96-7 THE EARTH LIFTED BY VARAHA[2]—Mbh, Āranyakaparvan (critical ed), 187 11, also Brahmapurāna, chap 213 40-42

IV *1* 18 A DRUM FROM MĀSA PLANT —(?) —The details are too meagre to indicate the source

IV *2* 19-21 A RIVER OF ELEPHANT ICHOR (Bhārata) —(?) —This quotation can be traced only with the aid of the Verse Index of Mbh

IV *3* 22-4 BHĪMA AND BAKA (Bhārata, according to the Sanskrit Text) —Mbh, Ādi (critical ed), 145-152 —The critical edition describes the demon's share of food at 148 6, but more detailed descriptions of it are found in different recensions of the Mbh see Ādi (critical ed), p 942, passage Nos 91-92 Haribhadra's details are more than covered by them

[1] The relevant lines run thus अन्योन्यप्रीतिरनयोरुमाशंकरयोरथ। श्लेषं ससक्तयोर्ज्ञात्वा शङ्कित किल वृत्रहा ॥ ताभ्यां मैथुनसक्ताभ्यामपत्योद्भवभीरुणा । तयो सकाशमिन्द्रेण प्रेषितो हव्यवाहन. ॥ अनयो रतिविघ्नं च त्वमाचर हुताशन । सर्वत्र गत एव त्वं न दोषो विद्यते तदा ॥

[2] The Sanskrit Text does not include this legend

IV *4* 25-6 KUMBHAKARNA'S MEAL —Rāmāyana, Yuddhakāṇḍa, 60 (especially verses 32-33, 62-63, 91-92)

IV *5* 27 AGASTYA DRINKS THE OCEAN —Mbh, Āranyakaparvan (critical ed), 101 10, 102 18f, 103 1-10

IV *6* 28-29 GAṄGĀ DRUNK BY JAHNU —Rāmāyana, Bālakāṇḍa, 43 34-38 —The exact period of one thousand years, noted by Haribhadra, is not mentioned in this context by the Rāmā

IV *7* 31-87 THE MIGHTY GARUDA —Mbh Ādi (critical ed), 14-32 —These chapters practically cover all the details noted by Haribhadra There are, however, some points of specific difference The Mbh notes only two eggs (14 12) of Vinatā giving birth to Aruna and Garuda, while Dhū mentions one more egg which was impatiently opened first and which produced a scorpion Secondly, it is the mother, according to Mbh, that tells Garuda the whereabouts of the nectar and that asks him to eat Nisādas (24 2), but according to Haribhadra it is Kāśyapa, the father, that gives these instructions Thirdly, the Mbh does not connect the dropping of Vata tree with Lankā Lastly, Viṣṇu is quite partial to Garuda almost from the beginning in the Mbh (129 12f)

IV *8* 88 GOVARDHANA MOUNTAIN LIFTED BY KRSNA —Brahmapurāṇa, chap 188 14f, Bhāgavata (Nirnayasāgara ed), X 25 19

IV *9* 89-80 MONKEYS BROUGHT MOUNTAINS FOR THE SETU —Rāmāyana, Yuddhakānda, 22 (especially verses 50-60)

IV *10* 91-93 HANUMAT ROOTS OUT TREES IN THE PARK[1] —Rāmāyaṇa, Sundarakānda, 41 (especially verses 10-21)

V *1* 11 BHĪMA AND HANUMAT GENERATED BY WIND —Mbh, Ādi (critical ed), 57 97, 61 84, Rāmāyana, Kiskindhākānda, 66 8-20 —According to Rāmā Hanumat's mother is called Añjanā and not Nīlā[2] Or is it that Haribhadra is paraphrasing *añjana by nila?*

V *2* 12-18 BIRTH OF VYĀSA —Mbh, Ādi (critical ed), 57 55-74, 99-100, also the additional passage No 37 on p 895 —According to the Mbh, Vidura is born from a maid servant (100 23)[3], and there is no reference to any curse on the three by Vyāsa

V *3* 23 KUNTI'S SON BY THE SUN —Mbh, Ādi, 57-82, see also the references and remarks on I *5* 58-84, para iv

V *4* 25-31 VOLUPTUOUS AGNI —(?) —According to the Mbh, Āranyaka (critical ed), 213, Agni was passionate for the wives of Saptarsis, and with his mind upset with passion, he ran to the forest It is Svāhā, the daughter of Daksa, that satisfied his passion

[1] Here Haribhadra quotes a rhyming couplet (No 92) in Prākrit which he calls Khamdao Though I could spot the necessary context, I do not find these lines in the Paumacariya, 53 78 f

[2] The Sanskrit and Gujarāti Texts have Añjanā for Nīlā in this context, see verse No 336 and p 62 1 1

[3] Hariṣeṇa gives, in his Bṛhat Kathākośa, 83, a story corresponding to Harbhadra's story Therein Śamtana or Śimtanu, has three sons, Citra, Vicitra and Citrānga, who leave behind three widows, Ambā, Ambikā and Bālikā (Ambālikā) from whom Vyāsa generates Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Pāṇḍu and Vidura respectively Haribhadra's phrase *bhāujjayā tinn vi* presumes such a story, see also story No 96 from the same

V *5* 33-37 (i) INDRA'S MISBEHAVIOUR WITH AHALYĀ, AND (ii) HIS SON FROM KUNTĪ —(i) Rāmāyana, Bālakānda, 48 15-28, Mbh, Anuśāsana (Bombay ed) 41, 21, also Brahmapurāṇa Adhyā 87 (ii) Mbh, Ādi (critical ed) 57 97 —According to Rāmā, Indra misbehaves with Ahalyā, the wife of Gautama who curses him to lose his testicles According to the Mbh, he has thousands of pores on his body as a result of the curse, and they were afterwards changed to eyes According to the Dhū, he was handed over to passionate pupils, but I do not find any such details in the above contexts The Brahmapurāna, however, tells us that Indra became a cat, but was cursed by Gautama to have thousand pores (*sahasra-bhagavān*) on his body When he prayed for mercy, he was blessed to be Sahasrāksa

V *6* 59 See above I *2* 39-40 —The natural inference is that there could be a pretty long tail of a mouse

V *7* 60-63 THE LONG TAIL OF HANUMAT (Rāmāyana) —Rāmāyaṇa, Sundarakānda, 53 (verses 5-8), 54

V *8* 64-69 (i) GANDHĀRIVARA CHANGED INTO KURABAKA, (ii) NAHUSA[1] BECOMES A BOA — (i) (?), (ii) Mbh, Āranyakaparvan (critical ed), 175-178, also App I, passages 19-20, pp 1065f —(i) It is not clear whether Gamdhārivara refers to Dhrtarāstra, (ii) The Mbh text has undoubtedly grown, and the present text shows more than seven questions

As distinguished from the above legends, the sources of which we have tried to trace, there are some casual references in the Dhū (I 62-4, V 114-18) to Purānic personalities and events Some of them are mere names, so some additional information may be noted here from second-hand sources[2]

Haribhadra expresses (once through the mouth of Indra) that Mahāvīra alone is an exception, and that all other so-called great personalities have been victims of cupidity and womanly temptations (I 64-4), or of passions in general (V iii) Gautama had a wife Ahalyā by name, at times, whenever taken as identical with Dīrghatamas, he is painted to be quite voluptuous —Vasistha had for his wives Ūrjā, Arundhatī etc, and he had one hundred sons —Parāśara, unmindful of place and time, fell in passionate love with Satyavatī, the fisher-girl —Jamadagni demanded, from king Renu, Renukā in marriage, he had five sons from her, but he was a terrible suspicious husband —Kaśyapa had more than a dozen wives and a pretty large number of sons —Agastya once realized that his ancestors could not be rescued without his begetting a son Then he formed a girl out of the most graceful parts of different animals and passed her secretly into the palace of the king of Vidarbha When the child grew up, he demanded her in marriage, somehow the king consented, and she became his wife Lopāmudrā To satisfy his wife, who had grown up in palace, he begged wealth from different kings —Indra selected Indrāṇī to be his wife because of her voluptuous attractions, he employed celestial nymphs to excite

[1] The Sanskrit text gives the name Nahuṣa, verse 385, but the Gujarāti one Naghuṣa, p 64 Is it that *hira so* is a wrong improvement on the original *nahuso*, being misread as *na hu so*?

[2] The following works are mainly used A Classical Dictionary of India by J Garret (Madras 1871) and its Supplement (Madras 1873), A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology etc by J Dowson (London 1879), Vedic Mythology by A A Macdonell (Strassburg 1897), Epic Mythology by E W Hopkins (Strassburg 1915), Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata etc by S Sörensen (London 1904-25), Bhāratavarṣīya caritrakośa by Chitrava (Poona 1932)

the passions of holy men, he is called *parastrīkāma-cārin*, a habitual adulterer, he tried to seduce Ruci, wife of Devaśarman, and his endeavour to seduce Ahalyā, wife of the sage Gautama, is well-known —Hara's attachment for Umā, who occupies half of his body, is often mentioned in the Purāna —Visnu has his wife in Laksmī, and in his incarnation of Krsna, he had 16000 wives, apart from his sports with Gopīs to whom he is so much attached (V 112-13) —Candra has twenty-seven wives, of whom Rohinī is the most favourite. He carried off Tārā, the wife of Brhaspati, from whom he had a son Budha by name —Vāyu generated Bhīma from Kuntī and Hanumat from Añjanā The hundred daughters of Kuśanābha would not comply with his licentious desires, so he made them crooked in physique, and thus their city came to be called Kanyā-kubja —Yama-Dharma had several wives as Hemalatā etc Dharma, one of the Prajāpatis, had married thirteen (or ten) of the daughters of Daksa, and had a numerous progeny He generated Yudhisthira from Kuntī

In conclusion, Haribhadra refers to a series of legends, particularly the births of Purānic personages (V 114-18), and summarily denounces them as unnatural and unworthy of any credence Some of them, viz, the births of Brahman (I 53-7), Tilottamā (I 58-84, III 27-37), Drona (I 60-61), Sanmukha (III 53-86), and of Svedakundalin and Nara, i e, Raktakundalin (I 58-84) are already referred to in the earlier discussion, and we have noted the relevant sources above Some particulars about the rest may be added here There is a legend that (Pavana-?) Ganapati originated from the scurf of Pārvatī's body —Urvaśī was so named, because she was born from the thigh —Nalakūbara and Manigrīva were excessively drunk and sporting in a nude condition in the river Ganges When Nārada came there, the ladies clothed themselves, but these two remained naked Nārada was offended, and cursed them to become trees for one hundred years They were relieved by the contact of Krsna who pulled the mortar, to which he was tied by his mother, through the interspace between the pair of Arjuna trees in which they were transformed —Vasudeva and Devakī were in the prison of Kamsa, and it is there that Devakī conceived Balarāma But in the seventh month, through the mediation of Māyā, the embryo was transferred to the body of Rohinī who was staying at Gokula This Balarāma of the Yādava race is considered to be an *amśa* of Śesa —Pārvatī is the daughter of Himālaya and Menā

The success of Haribhadra's performance depends primarily, if not entirely, on the intellectual integrity and fidelity with which he has presented the Purānic legends that are being satirised We can start *prima facie* that he would not dare to change the popular, mythological stories, at least their fundamentals, current in his locality and at his time, for, if he were to do so, he would be cutting the very ground under his feet, and his work would fall in the estimation of his contemporaries to whose gathering it has been already narrated at Citrakūta (V 123)

On the whole, we have been fairly successful in tracing the counterparts of the legends, quoted by Haribhadra, to their sources available today Haribhadra is not actually quoting in the very words of the original, but he is rewriting the legends in his words and mostly from memory Naturally we will have to make ample concession for omissions and minor variations in expression and presentation In some cases, Haribhadra's legends, when studied in comparison with those in the present-day texts, show differences in details Their significance depends upon their position in the story and on their relative bearing for the purpose of denunciation Some divergences are of minor significance for instance,

the names of the parents of Droṇa (I *6*), whether the Sage called the Boy or *vice versa* (II *2*), whether Reṇukā's chastity was respected by plants (III *1*), whether Upasunda or Nisunda is the name (III *3*), whether Vinatā laid two eggs or three (IV *7*); whether Yudhiṣṭhira asked the boa seven questions or more (V *8*), etc. Such differences do not affect the chief idea that is selected as the target for the satirical shaft. There are other differences of major significance: for instance, whether, according to the Purāṇic legend, Kīcakas were accommodated in and born from bamboo-hollows (I *3*), whether the lotus was caught stuck at Viṣṇu's navel (I *5*), whether Karṇa was born through the ear (I *6*), whether Drupada's bow is described in the epic to contain Nāgas etc. (II *5*), whether Hanumat climbed the mountain-like Jaṭāyu (II, *6*), etc. If these events have no basis in the Purāṇic stories, the very edge of Haribhadra's criticism is blunted, and his denunciation of Purāṇic legends becomes impertinent.

Before we raise the question, whether Haribhadra has really taken liberty with some of the legends, we have to remember that our epics and Purāṇas have not come down to us exactly in the same form in which they were current at the time of Haribhadra. Their texts have been subjected to so many vicissitudes in different localities and for centuries together that the authenticity of every episode, nay of every passage, is to be judged on its own merits. This is fully demonstrated by the critical edition of the Mahābhārata. The condition of the text-tradition of the Purāṇas is much worse. They present such an indiscriminate fusion of text-tradition and such a bewildering medley of myths that the wits of a text-critic would be completely stunned. Very good results have been achieved by the study of Mbh. Mss., and the late lamented Dr. V. S. Sukthankar has brilliantly sketched the pros and cons of the text-variation in the Mbh. in his following observations[1]: 'All the difficulties in the explanation of this phenomenal variation vanish, however, as soon as we assume that the epic was handed down from bard to bard originally by *word of mouth*, as is clearly implied by tradition. That would explain, without any strain or violence, the existence of the mass of variants, of differences in sequence and of additions and omissions. If the text has been preserved, for any considerable period of time, only in memory and handed down by word of mouth, those are just the changes that could not possibly be avoided. It is evident that no great care would be lavished on the text by these custodians of the tradition to guard it against corruption and elaboration, or against arbitrary emendation and normalization: to reproduce the received text, which was not guarded by canonical authority or religious sanction, with any degree of precision would be neither attempted by the bards nor required of them. Whenever and wherever the text was then written down—and it was probably written down *independently* in different epochs and under different circumstances—these transmissions by word of mouth must have contaminated the written text and innumerable variations in it. The assumption of some such complicated derangement, beyond the normal vicissitudes of transmission, is necessary to account for the abnormal discrepancies and strange vagaries of the Mahābhārata manuscript tradition. In other words, we are compelled to assume that even in its early phases the Mahābhārata textual tradition must have been not uniform and simple, but multiple and polygenous.' In another context Dr. V. S. Sukthankar has observed thus with regard to citations, and what is true about them nearly holds good with regard to legends and their contents[2]: 'Then in the case of citations we must allow for

[1] The Ādiparvan, Poona 1933, Prolegomena, p. 79.

[2] Prolegomena, p. 29.

failures of memory, and the quotation was never compared with the original Moreover we must never forget that probably from time immemorial there have existed local versions of the Mahābhārata The citations made even by very old writers were from these *local* versions A citation by a writer of the eighth century or even the sixth century proves nothing for the Ur-Mahābhārata, that ideal but impossible desideratum, though the citation is far older than our manuscripts, it is evidence only for the text of the *local* Mahābhārata in the eighth, respectively in the sixth century, notwithstanding that the differences between the various recensions and versions of the Mahābhārata must diminish as we go back further and further'

No doubt there must have been Mss of the epics and Purānas (III 53) in the days of Haribhadra, but generally the narratives were heard from the mouth of rhapsodists That they were handed down by word of mouth, as suggested by Sukthankar, is to a very great extent confirmed by the fact that, whenever Haribhadra appeals to the authority of Purānas etc, he uses almost uniformly terms like *suvvai*, *suam*, etc (I 35, 41, II 27, 31, 61, III 27, 38, 53, 66, 93, IV 19, 27, V 11, 33, 37, 60, 64, 112, 114, etc) It is not unlikely, therefore, that some discrepancies in the details, whether minor or major, might go back to the traditional narration which was recited round about Citrakūta at the time of Haribhadra, and we can hardly hope to trace the same necessarily in the present-day texts It is equally possible, in some cases where Haribhadra's statements show deviation from the sources, that he is criticising the legends which passed as such according to the tradition from which he got them One cannot be dogmatic on one or the other explanation, because the sources, so far tapped, are comparatively limited Further, when legends are quoted from memory, contamination, confusion and variation in details are inevitable The very fact that most of the legends or their nearest counterparts we have been able to trace to their sources clearly indicates that Haribhadra did not want to put forth imaginary legends and then to condemn them Though it is quite plain, it may be noted that the sources recorded by us do not indicate that all those works are necessarily older than Haribhadra, but it only means that those legends belong to a period earlier than that or Haribhadra He mentions only three works, by name, Bhārata, Rāmāyana and Visnupurāna, and all other sources are our suggestions

At times there is no agreement even among the Purānic legends For instance, according to one version, Agni was sent by gods to Śiva and Umā for a mighty son who can destroy Tārakāsura, while, according to another version, though less popular, he was sent by Indra to prevent Umā from conceiving a child Haribhadra narrates clearly the latter version, though the Sanskrit and Gujarāti versions of the Dhū, read there, wrongly of course, the popular legend The legend given by Haribhadra has its place in the present-day Vāyupurāna, as noted above It is interesting to note that, in some cases (I *5*, II *5*, IV *3*), the details of the legends are more specifically traced in the additional passages recorded in the foot-notes and Appendix of the critical edition of the Mbh That only means, the recension of the Mbh which reached Haribhadra's ears was more inflated than our critical text which is constituted according to well-established and judiciously evolved canons of text criticism based on the available Mss

Some of the legends quoted by Haribhadra appear to have been pieced together from different sources, even with mutual contamination (I *6*, III *3*) It is creditable to Haribhadra that the number of such cases is quite small This is inevitable in those days when one had to depend mainly on memory, which was a storehouse of all traditional lore, and not on books, as we do today

Among the legends, the sources of which Haribhadra has clearly mentioned, some are found in the present-day texts with substantial agreement in details (I *7*, II *1*, *2*, III *9* V *7*), but in three cases (I *3*, *6*, II *6*), though the sources are given as Bhārata and Rāmāyana, we do not find any passages in the present-day texts to support Haribhadra That Karna was born from Kuntī's ear is a common story, quite popular even to this day, though not found in the Mbh , and it is not surprising, if it was current in the days of Haribhadra too First, *karna* means the ear, and popular etymology would certainly weave out such a story, secondly, there is as well as psychological motive, namely, by Karṇa's birth through the ear Kuntī's virginity remains intact, his generation by Sūrya being after all miraculous, nay supernatural Though Mbh makes no mention of such a legend, I think, the birth of Kīcakas from *kīcakas* or bamboo-hollows is similarly based on popular etymology, such a legend might have been current in the days of Haribhadra, and it is quite in tune with a host of legends in the epics and Purānas with which the 'miraculous germination of the semen into human beings' is a regular 'apparatus for the generation of the great men of the past about whose birth nothing exciting was specially known to the chronicler' Coming to the episode of Jatāyu, the epics do mention the mountain-like shape of Jatāyu, and thereby Haribhadra's purpose is served But the details of the story cannot be fitted in the present mould of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa Haribhadra is quoting a Sanskrit verse[1] in that context, and it would indicate that he has some definite source before him

My observations on the sources of Haribhadra's legends, I am quite aware, are tentative, and I hope that those scholars, who have better library facilities at their disposal and who have a closer study of the Purāṇas, would try to shed more light on this topic

5 Sanskrit and Gujarati Dhurtakhyanas

The Sanskrit version of the Dhūrtākhyāna, included in this edition, is extracted from the Tattvakaumudī[2] which is a Vivarana or Vrtti by Sanghatilaka on the Samyaktvasaptatikā[3], attributed to Haribhadra[4] himself The *praśasti* of the Vrtti[5] gives a good

[1] The Sanskrit and Gujarāti Versions do not give this quotation

[2] This is published by the Devachandra Lālabhāi Jaina Pustakoddhāra Fund, No 35, Bombay 1916 This copy reached my hands rather late, so some details I have noted in the foot-notes

[3] This Sk Dhūrtākhyāna forms a part of the commentary on verse No 12 which runs thus मोहिज्जइ मंदमई कुदिट्ठिवयणोहिं गुविलदंढेहिं । दूरेण वज्जियव्वा तेण इमे सुद्धबुद्धीहिं ॥ १२ ॥ The story is introduced with this remark एतदर्थसत्यापनाये वैश्रमणश्रेष्ठिदृष्टान्तो मूलदेवादिपञ्चधूर्तस्वरूपोपलक्षितः प्रतन्यते, तथाहि—समस्ति etc At the close there are 28 verses more than what is printed here, they have nothing to do wih Dhū proper They tell us that Vaiśramana, by hearing all this from Susthita, developed firm Samyaktva He accepted the vows of a householder His wife also accepted *ratna-traya-dharma* Even when his wife was troubled by a Vyantarī, Vaiśramaṇa's faith in Jina was unshaken In due course he attained liberation The concluding portion runs thus इत्थं वैश्रमणस्य चारु चरितं श्रुत्वाश्रुतिप्रीणकं, मा रामायणभारतश्रुतिभवैर्वाक्यैर्विचाराक्षमै । मालिन्यं नयतातिनिर्मलतमं सद्दर्शनं पावनं, येन स्युर्भवतां जिनागमविदां शर्मश्रिय सुस्थिराः ॥ ४५५ ॥ [इति] कुदर्शनवर्जनविषये वैश्रमणकथा ॥ This edition of the commentry does not give any chapter headings or endings Sanghatilaka does not appear to have mentioned either Haribhadra or the name of the work, Dhūrtākhyāna

[4] Jaina Granthāvali, p 191

[5] Peterson Reports I, pp 92-4, Reports III, Index of Authors, p 124, also the Praśasti in the above edition, p 237

bit of information about Saṅghatilaka and his predecessors in the ascetic line It opens with the glorification of Candragaccha which belonged to the following teachers Vardhamāna, Jineśvara, Abhayadeva I (*rangan navāngī-mahāvṛtti-Stambhana-Pārśvanātha-jinarāṭ-mūrti-prakāśaikakṛt* the author of the commentaries on the nine Angas, [who became a Sūri in Samvat 1088 or 1031 A D])[1], Jinavallabha, Jinaśekhara, Padmacandra, Vijayacandra, Abhayadeva II (from whom started the Rudrapallīya-gaccah) Devabhadra, Prabhānanda, Śrīcandra and Vimalacandra, Guṇaśekhara and lastly Sanghatilaka, the author of Tattvakaumudī Sanghatilaka had his *vidyā-guru* in Jinaprabha[2] whose erudition had pleased, Sāhi Mahammada at Dhillī[3] He composed the Vṛtti at the request of Devendra who was an *anuja* of Somatilaka, an eminent pupil of Saṅghatilaka himself It was composed at Sārasvatapattana (Pātana?) [and finished] during Dīpotsava (i e , October-November) in the year 1422 (*śrīmad-Vikrama-vatsare dvi-nayanāmbhodhi-kṣa-pākṛt prame*) of the Vikrama era, i e ,-57=1365 A D

This Sanskrit Dhūrtākhyāna is neither a Chāyā nor a literal and studious metrical rendering or paraphrase of the Prākrit original, though it is solely based on it Sanghatilaka, there is not the least doubt, has the Prākrit text of Haribhadra before him, he is trying to present its contents, in simple Sanskrit verses, with sufficient closeness and strictly adhering to the same sequences of narration, and he attempts to include most of the ideas from the original, at times in identical expressions (Pk I 76, Sk 66 etc) He is more after narrating the story with as few secondary details as possible Whenever there are lengthy descriptions in the Prākrit text, he either summarises them or adds his own with a bit of independence It may be that even metrical exigencies have frustrated his attempts to be more close and literal in his rendering Sometimes he expresses the original with remarkable compactness (verses 82, 103, etc) and in a few cases with elegance and beauty (125, etc) He shows that he is fairly acquainted with the details of Purānic mythology the proper names are freely substituted by other synonyms (Svāmin=Skanda, Mahāsena=Sanmukha, etc), once an additional source, Bhārata (102) is rightly added, and sometimes are added supplementary details, such as, the names Dhūmornā and Nahusa (verses 351, 385) and the birth of Kārtikeya for the destruction of Tārakāsura (204 f) Sometimes his references to the sources are not quite to the point (169) and in one place (106) it is a bit obscure

Perhaps a verse between Nos 86[4] and 87 is missing Possibly in his zeal of summarising the story, Sanghatilaka skips over certain portions of the Prākrit text, viz , I 30-4, V 115 f The contents of some verses, for instance, III 83, V 80, are not fully covered the latter, it may be noted presents some difficulties of interpretation The legend of Varāha lifting the earth (III *10*) is missed by him, somewhere between verses 236-38 As to the quotations in the original, it appears that the author wants to present his text purely in Sanskrit some of the Prākrit quotations (II 50, III 67) are nicely rendered into Sanskrit (125, 215), some of those in Sanskrit are duly reproduced, but it is difficult to say why some (II 73, IV 92, V 4, 5, 103) are skipped over without any trace

[1] Peterson Reports IV, p iv

[2] Peterson Reports IV, Index of Authors, pp 37-8

[3] This king is apparently Muhammad Tughluq (1325-1351 A D) of Delhi For a detailed biography of Jinaprabhasūri, see the Intro by Nahtā to the Vidhimārgaprapā, ed Jinavijayaji, Bombay 1941

[4] On comparing with the ed of the commentary, I find an additional verse which runs thus तस्य मध्ये महाकाय सच्छायो वटपादप । कमलाख्यो महायक्षस्तन्मूलमधितिष्ठति ॥ [८६*१] ॥

More than once Sanghatılaka not only shows difference ın ideas but also adds new ıdeas, when compared wıth the Prākrıt orıgınal (see for ınstance Nos 21*d*, 23*d*, 159*b*, 161*d*, 199*d*, 204*b*, 239*d*, 242*d*, 243*d*, 316*ab*, 409*d*, 416*d*, etc) Some of these are apt sımıles, quıte credıtable to any poet

There are many places where one can easıly take exceptıon to Sanghatılaka's renderıng of the orıgınal *lhasıya-celam* (I 60)=*dūsıta-vāsasam* (52), *seaṁ* (I. 74)=*śesam* (64), *Sea-kumḍalī nāma*[1] (I 75)=*Sıtakundalı-nāmā* (65), *namıūna Jınavarımdam* (II 24)= *nrpatım natvā* (99)[2], *phuttam du-bhāgajāyam* (II 29)=*trıvıdhatām agamat* (104), etc Hıs statement that the progeny of Gaurī and Śamkara was requıred for destroyıng Tāraka (203-4), though quıte ın agreement wıth a Purānıc tradıtıon, ıs contradıctory to the explıcıt statement of Harıbhadra (III 55) who follows a slıghtly dıfferent tradıtıon[3]

On account of ıts beıng a part of the commentary, the openıng and concludıng portıons of the Sanskrıt Dhūrtākhyāna do not gıve ıt an appearance of a self-suffıcıent unıt More than once, ıt comes to our help ın clearly understandıng the Prākrıt text of Harıbhadra[4]

The Dhūrtākhyāna ın Old-Gujarātī, ıncluded ın thıs edıtıon, mentıons at ıts close that ıt was wrıtten (*lısıtam*) or copıed by Pt Laksmīkīrtı, the pupıl of Ratnasundaragānı of the Jınamānıkya-śākhā of the Kharatara-gaccha at Udaıpura ın Samvat 1758 (-57=1701 A D), Kārtıka Śukla, 12, Saturday The word *lısıtam* should ordınarıly mean 'copıed', so thıs proof ıs not enough to ınfer that Laksmīkīrtı ıs the author of thıs Gujarātı work In fact, we do not know the name of ıts author, and all that we can say about hım ıs thıs much he flourıshed earlıer than 1701 A D , he had realısed that the Dhūrtākhyāna was an effectıve attack agaınst the Purānıc relıgıon and the Purānas, and he wrote the tales, from the Dhūrtākhyāna of Harıbhadra, ın the *loka-bhāsā*, that they mıght be ıntellıgıble to laymen (*bālâvabodha-rūpāh kathāh*)

The author's prımary aım ıs to narrate the storıes ıncluded by Harıbhadra ın hıs Dhū He closely follows the Prākrıt text, and maınly concentrates hıs attentıon on narratıng the storıes, ıgnorıng the mosaıc descrıptıons of Harıbhadra and spıcy sımıles of Sanghatılaka At tımes hıs renderıng ıs quıte lıteral To make the narratıon effectıve, he amplıfies the orıgınal by addıtıonal remarks (p 49, ll 19, 22-3, p 60, ll 5-6, p 64, ll 21-23, etc) Some verses ın the Prākrıt (III 83, V 80) are not duly covered, and some detaıls (V 115 f) are dısposed off summarıly Partly agreeıng wıth Sanghatılaka, some quotatıons are not ıncluded (II 73, IV 92, V 4, 5, 18, 103) Somehow I 87* 1 ıs quoted wıth some dıfferent readıngs

There ıs not the least doubt that the author ıs maınly followıng the Prākrıt text hıs Gujarātı renderıng, as a rule and throughout the work, agrees more wıth Prākrıt orıgınal than wıth the Sanskrıt versıon of Sanghatılaka, two quotatıons (II 50, III 67) whıch are rendered ınto Sanskrıt by Sanghatılaka, are quoted ın Prākrıt, as ın the orıgınal, by our

[1] The Gujarātı text reads *Śvetakundalı nāmı*

[2] In thıs partıcular case, as requıred by the context, Sanghatılaka appears to have had before hım a readıng lıke *namıūna naravarımdam* because Jına ıs not at all ıntroduced ın the earlıer part of the story The presıdıng deıty ıs a Yakṣa The Gujarātı text also says *rājāne pranamī*

[3] See III *6* above

[4] In contınuatıon of what my frıend Dr A M Ghatage has saıd (New Indıan Antıquary, I, 5, August 1938), I mıght record here that Sanghatılaka uses the from *mutkalāpya* (334, 394), gerundıve from the root *mutkalāp* , and ıt stands once for *āucchıūna*, 'havıng taken leave' (V 9) and once for *pucchıum*, 'havıng taken permıssıon' (V 74) ın the orıgınal Prākrıt

author (pp 54, 57), and one legend, III *10*, omitted by the Sk text, is duly given by him (p 58) Though the Prākrit text is mainly and closely followed, there is sufficient proof to indicate that he has consulted the Sanskrit text of Sanghatilaka Many points and remarks, which are not found in the Prākrit but are present in the Sanskrit text, are seen in this Gujarāti version At I 35 Haribhadra has *Bhārahe purāne a,* Sanghatilaka has in the corresponding passage (29) *Śrī-Rāmāyana-Bhārate,* and the Guja text has *Bhārata Rāmāyanādika gramthe* (p 50, I 24) This is perhaps the only reference, in the first two chapters, indicating explicitly the influence of the Sk text From the third chap onwards we see more of this influence, and even some phrases here and there remind us of the Sk text Pk *dhāuvvāya-pisāena* (III 1), Sk *dhātuvādâdyair vyasanaih* (150), Guj *dhātu-vādādika vyasanai* (p 55), Pk no specific number, Sk *stenāh pañca śatīmitāh* (159), Guj *pāmca sai caura* (p 56), etc [1] Then in describing the origin of Skanda (p 57) to destroy Tārakāsura, the Gujarāti version closely follows the Sk text, so also in supplying the names of Dhūmorṇā Nahuṣa, etc Thus the writer of the Guj Dhūrtākhyāna has used Sanghatilaka's work here and there

The author claims that these stories are being written in *loka-bhāṣā* which means the popular language (current, say roughly, in Northern Gujarāta, sometime before 1701 A D) as distinguished from the literary languages like Sanskrit, Prākrit and even Apabhramśa The author, it is clear, is well-versed in Prākrit and Sanskrit, and inevitably the large sprinkling of Sanskrit words, seen in these stories, is due more to the author's command over Sk vocabulary than to the actual usage of the contemporary *loka-bhāsā* This inference is quite natural when we look at the percentage of pure Sanskrit words in any modern Indian language as used by a Śāstrin, or even an educated man, and an illiterate villager Loan words are an unsafe evidence in understanding the essential grammatic structure of any *loka-bhāṣā,* because they can be easily grafted anywhere, and it is all the more true in the case of religious books whose topics were usually described in Sanskrit terms So the *loka-bhāsā,* or Old-Gujarāti, in which our author wrote could not have contained so many Sk words, and we should study its nature by taking into account declensional forms, verbal formations, particles etc An exhaustive study of the language cannot be attempted here, but I would simply note a few formations which are interesting to a student of Apabhramśa and post-Apabhramśa stages especially in Rājasthāna and Gujarāta Nominal forms *joyana, thāma* 'a place', *tarasī* 'thirst', *pāyaka* 'a foot-soldier', *be strīu, bhojāio* (Pk *bhāujjāyā*), *mācchinī* 'a fisher woman', *rātā phala* 'red fruits' Pronominal forms *tum, mujha, hum* (also *hume*) etc Particles *jima, pina* 'also, but', *v l pani* (p 50, *l* 11, foot-note 13), *ma, hethāi, hethi, v l , hethum* Verbal forms *ūpanā, kahau, chai, joum, jovai, dājhato, paithum, paisūn parai, paranai, bīha, bhāgo, mūo, mokalajyo, lāgo, sakai, humto,* etc [2]

The above illustrations are picked up at random, and there is no pretension to an exhaustive study Apart from the large number of Sanskrit loan words, this *loka-bhāṣā* shows many words used in Prākrits, and some of the particles are the same as those in Apabhramsa The pronouns and verbal formations of the Apabh stage have undergone a great deal of change which is natural and unavoidable in the evolution of spoken languages

[1] Compare Sanskrit verses 231, 236, 262 with the corresponding Gujarāti portions

[2] It is interesting to compare these forms with those recorded in the Index of A Study of the Gujarāti Language by T N Dave, London 1935 The prose commentary in Old Gujarāti (on the Upadeśamālā) on which Dr Dave's study is based is called Bālāvabodha, and it may be noted that the Gujarati version of the Dhū, also bears the same name

Some changes are just a matter of shifting pronunciation *kahaü>kahau, dajjhamto> dājhato, mokkalijjaü>mokalajyo, sakkai>sakai*, etc Rājasthānī and Gujarātī are more lucky than any other modern Indian language because of their rich heritage of earlier stages of the language, and a careful study of the texts, from century to century, would certainly demonstrate the evolution of these languages through Prākrit, Apabhramśa and post-Apabh stages of the Middle Indo-Aryan

The Sanskrit and Gujarātī Dhūrtākhyānas cannot be judged as original contributions like their Prākrit counterpart, they definitely indicate, however, that the performance of Haribhadra did appeal to subsequent generations, and, as they stand today, they are useful aids to understand and check the Prākrit text of Haribhadra

6 Dhurtakhyana and Dharma-Pariksa

We come across a pretty large number of works called Dharma-parīksā (Dp)[1] Most of them are not critically examined as yet It is Amitagati's Dp that has been exhaustively studied,[2] and it can be accepted as a representative of Dp texts for all practical purposes Vrttavilāsa, Padmasāgara and others have mechanically followed Amitagati's Dp By the discovery of Harisena's Dp (Samvat 1044,-56=A D 988), which was written 26 years earlier than that of Amitagati (Samvat 1070,-56=A D 1014), it is clear now that Amitagati is not the creator of the plot of Dp Amitagati tells us that he composed his work in two months[3] no doubt, he is a gifted didactic poet with a flowing Sanskrit style, but he does not mention his predecessors Harisena, however, frankly says that the Dp which was formerly composed by Jayarāma in Gāthā metre is now composed by him in Paddhadiyā metre Unfortunately Jayarāma's Dp has not come to light so far Harişena's Dp is in Apabhramśa, there is no conclusive evidence to establish that Amitagati solely followed Harisena, the plot of the story, adopted by both Harisena and Amitagati, is remarkably identical, what Harisena says would indicate that almost all his material was present in Jayarāma's Dp , and Amitagati's Sanskrit expression betrays Prākritisms in narrative portions All these facts go to indicate that Jayarāma's work was in Gāthā metre, the language being Śaurasenī or Māhārāstrī and for the present we might presume that the plot of Dp owes its birth to Jayarāma

Comparing the works of Harisena and Amitagati one finds that, so far as the events of the plot and their sequence are concerned, both of them are in close agreement This indicates that Amitagati has not taken much liberty with the structure of the plot Harişena's text is not available in print, so I give below the analysis of the narrative structure[4]

[1] See my paper 'Harişeṇa's Dharma-parīkṣā in Apabhramśa' in the Silver Jubilee Number, Annals of the B O R I , Vol XXIII, pp 592-608

[2] N Mironow Die Dharma-parikṣā des Amitagati, Leipzig 1903

[3] The Sanskrit text with Hindi translation has been published by Pannalal Bakaliwal, Bombay 1901, another edition giving the Marāṭhi translation of Pt Bahubali Sharma has appeared lately, Sangli 1931 One feels the necessity of a critical edition of Amitagati's text

[4] Mironow follows the rule 'divide et impera' and presents the summaries of various stories separately The method is admirable and quite suited for studying the stories But the analysis of disjoined stories does not clearly bring out the effect of entire work, especially of the fantastic tales and the bearing of subsequent legends on their points Just to bring out this aspect of Dp clearly, I have added here a bit detailed summary Those who want more paticulars about individual stories may either consult the original Sk text or Mironow's dissertation

of Amitagati's Dp which would enable us to compare and contrast the two works, Dhū and Dp

In Jambūdvīpa, on the southern range of Vijayārdha, in the town named Vaijayantī there lived a Vidyādhara king Jitaśatru and his queen Vāyuvegā who had a son Manovega endowed with faith in Jina's doctrines His friend Pavanavega, prince of Priyāpurī, had no such faith, and he was much worried on that account Once returning from his visit to Jina-temples, his *vimāna* stopped at Ujjainī, in Mālava, and in its northern park there was an omniscient monk, Jinamati, on whom he waited with reverence Jinamati expounded to the audience the proportion of pleasure and pain in *samsāra* with the explanation of *madhu-bindu-dṛṣṭānta* and the consequences of religious and irreligious life Manovega asked Jinamati whether his friend Pavanavega would possess *samyaktva*, and he got a reply that he could enlighten his friend by taking him to Pāṭaliputra Pavanavega was anxious to meet his friend Manovega whom he met on the way to the joy of both Manovega told him how he visited various Jaina holy places and came to Pāṭaliputra, a prosperous centre of Brahmanic ritual and learning Pavanavega expresses his impatience to visit Pāṭaliputra, and next morning both of them reached there and got down in the park

I Both of them, though decked with ornaments, assumed the form of faggot-grass sellers It was a surprising sight to one and all who began to speculate about them They reached the Brahma-śālā, bet the drum, and sat on the golden seat At this challenge Brāhmanas rushed forth for dispute They wondered at their splendour and grace and almost mistook them for gods On being pointedly questioned, Manovega, requesting them not to be irritated, told them that all that they did was out of mere curiosity and that they were mere grass-selling boys whose prototypes were found in Bhārata stories One Brāhmana asked 'How can there be grass-faggot-sellers decorated with jewels? If such cases are found in the Rāmāyana and Bhārata, we would like to hear them' Manovega said that he would explain everything, if there are any thoughtful (*vicāraka*) among them otherwise his fate would be like that of Madhukara who received 16 strokes for telling the truth about the heaps of pepper and grains in different parts of the country The leader assured him that they were all thoughtful Brāhmanas Further Manovega told them that he feared to speak, if any of them belonged to the following ten types of men (about whom ten stories are narrated) (1) *rakta*, a passionate husband duped by his younger wife, (2) *dviṣṭa*, who wants his son to take revenge on his enemy by using his dead body (3) *mūdha*, a silly priest outwitted by his unchaste wife and pupil, (4) *vyudgrāhin*, a blind block-head prince, (5) *pitta-dūṣita*, a bilious fellow mistaking sweet as sour, (6) *cūta*, a wreckless king who pulled out the mango tree, (7) *kṣīra*, a foolish Tomara chief who ill treated a milch cow, (8) *aguru*, an ignoramus who could not understand the value of *aguru* plantation, (9) *candana*, a washerman incapable of recognising sandal, and (10) *bāliśa* Four fools, once upon a time, saluted a Jaina saint, endowed with various religious and ascetic virtues, who uttered the blessing '*dharma-vrddhi*' They began to quarrel as to whom it was meant for, and when they asked the monk, he told them that it was meant for him who was decided to be the most foolish by the wise people of the town after hearing their biographies (10*a*) Visameksana narrated thus 'One day I was sleeping with my two wives on both sides Just for joke, I placed the lamp on my forehead A mischievous rat pulled the burning wick, and one of my eyes was scorched Afraid of disturbing my wives, I allowed my eye to be burnt' (10*b*) Kuntahamsagati spoke thus 'Rksī and Kharī are my most ugly wives, their mutual jealous abuse and

quarrel made me lose both my legs, and being afraid of them, I tolerated all this' (10c) Bota (or Boda) said thus 'I had been to my father-in-law At night, I had a bet with my wife that one who speaks first should give a rich feast A thief entered the house and collected all the treasure He began stripping my wife of her clothes on the body I kept quiet She began to abuse me at the loss of wealth and at her insult I at once told her that she lost the game by speaking first, and she should give the feast now' (10*d*) Gallasphotika told his tale thus 'I had gone to the house of my father-in-law Out of bashfulness and seeing some hedious sight, I did not take my meals As time passed, I was overpowered by hunger I was just gulping a handful of fine rice kept in a basket below the cot when my wife came there, and I could not swallow them My mouth was full to the brim, I could not speak, and my cheeks grew hard There was a great row, and different explanations were offered about my disease A skilful physician diagnosed my trouble, calling it *tandulīya* ailment, he quietly bored my cheeks and took out rice particles Thus I made myself an object of ridicule' After hearing these tales, the Brāhmanas assured Manovega that none from them belonged to any of the ten types and that he should answer their question Manovega spoke thus 'Visnu is a mighty divinity, full of glory, grace and power, then how is it that he stayed as a cowherd-boy at Gokula sporting in various ways, that he became a messenger of Pāndavas and a charioteer of Arjuna, that he begged at Bali's door, and that he suffered from Sītā's separation? If that divine Visnu could do mean acts, what is wrong in our selling grass and faggots? The Brāhmanas felt disillusioned, and they could see how god Visnu was exposed to so many blemishes and inconsistencies, and how Purānas were full of contradictions

11 Second time Manovega became a rough hunter, and his friend, a cat without ears, put in a pot They met Brāhmanas as before, and told them how the cat had the power of warding off rats at miles' distance and that it was for sale Brāhmanas realized its utility and were ready to buy it at the quoted price On examination, however, it was found that it was devoid of ears which, Manovega explained, were eaten by ferocious rats one night Brāhmanas laughed at his daring contradiction Manovega refused to admit that the single flaw of not having ears spoiled all other virtues of the cat The Brāhmanas assured him that they were not 'Frogs in the Well', but they questioned him straight 'How can this flaw of the cat be tolerated'?

Manovega then narrated the legend of passionate Agni (or of Yama and Chāyā) 'The ascetic Mandapakausika feared that he might lose heaven for want of progeny, so he married a widow from whom he had a beautiful daughter Chāyā by name While going on pilgrimage, he just thought to what god he should entrust his daughter who would not be able to stand the strain of journey He began scrutinizing the acts and character of different gods Isvara is extremely passionate, Hari is not satisfied with 16 thousand Gopīs, Brahman was mad after Tilottamī and lost his head, and once he generated Jāmbava from a bear, and Indra misbehaved with Ahalyā All these gods are victims of cupid So he kept Chāyā with Yama who too, as days passed, fell in love with her and always carried her in his stomach Agni was jealous of Yama's prize One day when Yama had taken her out on the bank of Ganges, Agni mated with her Just at that moment Yama came there She swallowed Agni, and Yama swallowed her Agni was missing to the distress of all At last Vāyu managed to expose both Chāyā and Agni Agni tried to conceal himself when pursued by Yama If Agni can still be a god with all this blemish, my cat's virtues can remain intact without ears' Brāhmanas admitted

that Purāṇas were inconsistent Manovega further pointed out the blemishes of Śamkara, Viṣṇu, Brahman, Indra, Yama, Agni, Sun, etc.

III Third time Manovega assumed the form of a nude Jaina monk, and accompanied by Pavanavega, he met Brāhmaṇas as before They assured him that they were not like that king of Campā who illtreated his truth-speaking minister, and requested him to narrate how he became a monk etc Manovega spoke thus 'My father is Munidatta, a Śrāvaka from Śrīpura, and he entrusted me to an ascetic for study Once I was sent out with the Kamandalu to bring water, but I sat playing with it on the road Having learnt from other pupils that the teacher was angry, I ran towards the town On the way a mountain-like elephant rushed against me Helpless and terrified I entered into the Kamandalu which was placed on the branch of *bhinda*, the elephant also rushed into it, and began tearing my clothes with its trunk I ran out through the spout, the elephant also followed me, but with its tail stuck there, it fell on the ground I reached a Jaina temple, and not getting clothes I accepted this traditional form of a Jaina monk' The Brāhmanas laughed at him as a fantastic lier telling impossibilities When they assured him to abandon such scriptures as contained these details, he narrated to them the following episodes Arjuna brought the Nāgaloka through an arrow-hole, Agastya drank the whole ocean, and his Kamandalu containing the universe was put on the branch of an *atasī* plant, and Brahman's hair was caught at Visnu's navel when the former came out of latter's stomach after seeing there the universe which was once missing If these legends are true, it is quite possible that the elephant could pass through the Kamandaluhole, be accommodated in the Kamandalu, and have it's tail stuck in the spout The Brāhmanas were thus silenced, and they were further instructed by him on the faults of divinities and on the true nature of God

IV Fourth time Manovega became a Tāpasa, and accompanied by his friend, met the Brāhmanas as before On condition that they are quite considerate, he narrated his tale thus 'At the time of my mother's marriage there was a confusion created by an elephant She rushed out with the bridegroom at whose touch she fell in a swoon, but he ran away It was discovered that she was pregnant due to his touch Hearing of a 12 years' famine from Tāpasas, I remained in the womb all the while and came out when the famine was over As soon as I was born, I took a pot and demanded food It was considered ominous, and I had to leave home and become a Tāpasa like this My mother was rightly married again, as though she tried to follow Draupadī's example I came here on my religious tour' The Brāhmanas said that he was a first-rate lier talking impossible things, they admitted that they were open to correction, if such details were found in their Scriptures Manovega, to confirm his experience, narrated the following legends Bhagīratha was conceived at women's mutual contact, Gandhārī became pregnant by embracing a jackfruit tree, Abhimanyu understood *cakra-vyūha* while he was in the womb, Mandodarī conceived at the contact of her father's semen, had her foetus restrained in the womb for seven thousand years, and delivered Indrajit after being married to Rāvaṇa, Vyāsa accepted renunciation immediately after his birth, and his mother remained still a virgin, Kuntī remained a *kanyā* even after begetting a son from the Sun, and Candramatī was still a *kanyā* after Nāgaketu's birth and was married to Uddālaka If these Purānic legends are true, there is nothing incredible in my mother conceiving me at her beloved's touch, in my hearing about the famine from the womb, in my remaining there for twelve years, in my becoming an ascetic soon after my birth,

and in my mother becoming again a *kanyā* after delivering me' Manovega further enlightened Pavanavega and all others there by narrating the true tales about Karna, Vyāsa, Pāṇḍavas, etc He illustrated to them how people mechanically and thoughtlessly follow others, as in that story of the Copper Pot

V Fifth time Manovega, along with Pavanavega, became a Buddhist monk (*rakta-paṭa*), and on being assured by Brāhmanas that they were thoughtful, he narrated his wonderful experience 'We are devotees of Buddhist monks Once with sticks in our hands we were appointed by them to guard their clothes spread in sun-shine Two terrific jackals came there, and we mounted the Stūpa with fear, they, however, lifted it up, and flew away speedily When they dropped us with a view to devour us, there arrived Bhillas with dogs, and the jackals ran away As we were in an unknown country, we easily became Buddhist monks' Brāhmanas wondered at his astonishing lies, but he reminded them of the following legend According to the Rāmāyana, each monkey lifted five mountains If this is true, two jackals can easily lift a Stūpa

VI At last Manovega and Pavanavega became Śvetāmbara monks (*śveta-bhikṣu*) and met the Brāhmanas who asked them why they became monks and who was their *guru* Manovega continued in reply 'Once our father Arunaśrīka sent us into the forest to graze the sheep, because the shepherd had to attend his father who was down with fever I requetsed my companion to tend the sheep, so that in the meanwhile I might eat some *kapittha* fruits The desire for fruits was very strong, but the tree was too tall I went near, cut my head, and threw it on the tree requesting it to eat the fruits, as it ate fruits on the tree, my stomach was getting full below, and when I was satisfied, the head came down and joined the body as before I looked for my brother, but found him asleep and all the sheep lost We feared that our father would beat us, so we went away to a distant territory and accepted this comfortable garb' Manovega further confirmed to the Brāhmanas the truth of his experience by narrating the following legends Cutting his nine heads Rāvana offered them to Śambhū, and these were again joined to his body, Dadhimukha's head could get itself joined with another's trunk, parts of Angada's body were joined by Hanumat, Jarāsamdha's body was constituted of different parts, Skanda's person was made up of six portions, and when the priests are fed, the ancestors are satisfied If all this, narrated in Brahmanic scriptures, is true, there is nothing improbable in my own head joining the body, and in my stomach being filled when my mouth eats *kapittha* fruits'

The Brāhmanas were discomfited, and had no replies to give Manovega explained to Pavanavega various other flaws in the religion and scriptures of Brāhmanas, he expounded to him how the heretical creeds originated, and he also propounded Jaina principles and practices at length Pavanavega came to possess *samyaktva* and duly accepted the vows of a Śrāvaka Both Manovega and Pavanavega led a happy life of religious householders

The Purāna-like beginning, the religio-didactic discourse in the form of *madhu-bindu-dṛṣṭānta*, the abnormal proportion of folk-tales introduced by way of illustration, the different names of characters, immediate purpose of converting Pavanavega to Jainism by his pious friend Manovega, constant repetition of moral teachings and religious prescriptions, casual and side attacks on gods and holy men, and above all the general framework of the story make Dp much different from Dhū But if we go a bit deeper and study Dp more analytically and scrutinisingly, the inner kernel of Dp, though heavily

superimposed with good many accessories and details, remarkably corresponds with that of Dhū. The mode of presentation is somewhat different, but the purpose is the same Dhū is a satiric attack on the Purāṇic legends referring to deities and holy personalities, and Dp, as indicated even by its name, is out to scrutinize the credentials of other religions by criticising their deities and mythology, of course for a specified and immediate aim of converting Pavanavega Haribhadra's concluding suggestion (V 122) that the study of Dhū leads to *darsana-śuddhi* has been fully developed later [1] Dp actually converts Pavanavega who comes to possess *samyaktva,* and the narration of the Dhū -story, according to Sanghatilaka, makes Vaiśramana-śresthin a pious believer (*su-śrāddha*) with firm faith in Jina. What is implicit, artistic and detached in the Dhūrtākhyāna becomes outspoken, religio-didactic and propagandistic in the Dharmaparīksā In Dhū the five Dhūrtas narrate tales of fantastic personal experience, and some points from them are confirmed to be reliable by other Dhūrtas after quoting parallel legends from Purānas In Dp Manovega himself, being a Vidyādhara, assumes six different forms, and then he either presents an inconsistent situation or narrates an improbable tale of personal experience When his inconsistencies are exposed by the learned gathering of Brāhmaṇas, he silences them by quoting similar episodes from their Purānas Besides this fundamental similitude between Dhū and Dp, there are closely corresponding motifs in the fantastic autobiographical tales, and some of the confirmatory legends are common Mūladeva and the Jaina monk tell nearly the same episode of Kamandalu and Elephant [2] Immediately after their birth, Khaṇḍapānās son walked away taking leave of his mother, and Tāpasa demanded food and accepted renunciation Śasa lifted up the elephant-hide-bag full of oil, and the two jackals, in the Buddhist monk's tale, lift up a Stūpa Elāsādha's head, cut off by the thieves, eats *badara* fruits on the tree, and the Śvetāmbara monk throws his head on the tree in order to eat *kapittha* fruits Legends like Brahman's lotus or hair sticking at Visnu's navel, Vyāsa's birth, Monkeys lifting mountains, and the physical make up of Jarāsamdha and Sanmukha are quoted in both Dhū and Dp to confirm almost common motifs Though not in identical contexts there are many details and legends common to both Dhū and Dp loose morals of gods (Dhū I 60 f, Dp XI 21 f), Brahman and Tilottamā (Dhū I 58-84, Dp XI 29 f), Indra and Ahalyā (Dhū V 33-36, Dp XI 61 f), Agni's mating with Yama's beloved[3] (Dhū V 26-30, Dp XI especially 82 f), Agastya drinking the ocean (Dhū IV 27, Dp XIII 18 f), Kuntī's sons from Sūrya etc (Dhū I. 82 f, V 11, 23, 37, Dp XIV 91, XV 11), the male organ of Siva (Dhū I 39-4, V 59, Dp XIII 80)[4], etc

[1] Though the Dhū does not mention any such event, the Prabhāvakacarita of Prabhācandra (A D 1277) records that Haribhadra diverted that layman Kārpāsika from partiality for the Bhārata and Itihāsa by telling him the five stories of rogues (*kitava-kathānaka-pañcaka*), and won him over to the Jaina faith (verses IX 207-12) Prabhācandra quotes V 120 thus एय लोइयकव्वं गड्डहलिडं व बाहिरे मट्ठं। अंतो फोडिज्जंतं तुसबुसभुसमीसियं सव्वं ॥ and to explain this verse Haribhadra is said to have composed the Dhūrtākhyāna

[2] Two adjectives of the elephant are almost common te Dhū and Dp

[3] The legend in Dhū is shorter, and we do not find there the name of Chāvā and her association with Maṇḍapakauśika, given in Dp

[4] The town of Ujjainī with its northern park is introduced in both Dhū (I 2-3) and Dp (I, 58, 64), though in different contexts

The hungry Dhūrtas narrating their experiences and confirming the same with Purāṇic legends during a rainy week, with their dinner depending on the decision of their discussion, present a background (in Dhū) which is much dissimilar to that depicted in Dp in which a learned gathering of Brāhmanas of Pātaliputra is visited on six successive days by Manovega (with his friend Pavanavega) who, modestly avoiding debate with Brāhmanas even after he beats the drum and sits on the golden seat, narrates fantastic tales and himself confirms the same with Purāṇic legends, when challenged about the veracity of his statements In Dhū it is the autobiographical experience that forms the back-bone of the story, the points of which are confirmed by Purāṇic legends, and so it is in the last four stories, i e, III-VI, of the Dharma-parīkṣā The first two contexts in Dp, i e, I and II, present not an inconsistent and improbable story, but an incredible situation presented to the eye those who have ornaments on their body cannot be grass-faggot-sellers, and a cat which is claimed to scare away rats at miles' distance by its presence cannot have its ears eaten by rats The first situation is justified by the example of Viṣṇu, and the second by saying that a single flaw of the cat can be tolerated or ignored as in the case of god Agni The Dhū has no Brahmanic audience explicitly before it, while in Dp Manovega is actually made to encounter the Brāhmanas in their own citadel and to outwit them by openly pointing out and criticising inconsistent elements in the Purāṇic mythology The episode of the Buddhist monk in Dp (No V) is not quite successful, because it affords opportunity to satirize only one legend from the Rāmāyana

Jayarāma's Dp is not available to us, and Hariṣena's Dp is still in MSS If we are to be guided by Amitagati's work, we find that he attacks vehemently the Purāṇic deities, even when they do not figure in the legends satirised, here and there he adds certain Purāṇic stories, as they ought to be and as they are accepted by Jaina tradition, now and then he offers pithy maxims of worldly wisdom and sections of didactic teaching, he loses no opportunity to denounce worldly pleasures and prescribe religious discourses, and he not only criticises Purāṇic religion but adds also substantial details on Jaina mythology, dogmatics and ethics These are some of the specialities of the Dp text as it came to be shaped by Amitagati

The points of similarity, already noted above, do indicate that Jayarāma must have used the Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra or some subsequent recension of it The agreement is of a fundamental character and cannot be brushed aside as accidental or incidental The illustrative sub-stories and the tales of four fools, included in Dp, show that some other popular stories have been intelligently used Haribhadra by his satirical genius of a very high order merely smashed the structure of Purāṇic mythology, but the authors of Dp have gone a few steps ahead that they tried to erect instead a superstructure of Jaina religious preaching The artistic mould of Dhū is missed, but a form of effective propaganda has been evolved, and it became much popular in subsequent centuries as indicated by the number of Dp texts in different languages [1] It is quite natural that

[1] My friend Prof D L Narasimhachar, Mysore, draws my attention to one more Dp (in addition to those which I have mentioned in my paper on Hariṣeṇa's Dp) in Kannaḍa by Candrasāgara Varṇi He has seen a MS, and has kindly sent some extracts to me We learn the following details from them The Dp of Vrttavilāsa, the pupil of Rāvaḷa Yatīśvara, could be understood only by the learned, so the Śrāvakas of Beḷugula requested Cārukirti Paṇḍitācārva to get prepared a rendering of it in modern Kannaḍa (*Kamnaḍa-vyākhyānadalli māḍisi koḍiembadāgi*) This then at the instance of Cārukīrti, came to be composed by Candrasāgara who offers salutation to both Cārukirti and [Lakṣmīsena] Svāmi of Kolhapur It is written in simple Kannaḍa, mostly in prose Following Vṛttavilāsa's Dp it has ten chapters It is said to be written in Śaka (1770+78=1848 A D), Ānanda Samvatsara

Amitagati, or even his predecessors, utilised different and additional Purānic legends for the same purpose The Dp texts are stamped with a definite religious bias perhaps that prohibited them from admitting a character like Khandapānā, and on that account some of the fantastic tales are toned down, in some cases being followed by a few Purāṇic legends It is interesting to note that sometimes Amitagati, though he is a full-fledged propagandist, writes in a half-serious, mocking mood, even when he introduces a Digambara monk (Dp XII, 88 f) That is a befitting tone for a satirical writer The Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra, we have seen, is a unique satire, and its successors like the Dharma-parīksā are a fine specimen of Indian literature which is both interesting and instructive The caustic prick, which such works might have given to the zealous followers of Purānic religion, has not much effect on the dispassionate student of Indian literature for him every novel aspect adds to the wealth of the great literary heritage of the past

7. PRĀKRIT DIALECT AND STYLE OF DHŪRTĀKHYĀNA

The Prākrit text of Dhūrtākhyāna, presented in this edition, is based only on two MSS, and still one is faced with difficulties, here and there, in construing and interpreting it satisfactorily It is, therefore, far from being final, and any attempt to prepare an exhaustive grammar of it is out of question at present It is intended here just to note a few salient features of the Prākrit dialect of Dhū, as it stands in this edition

It has been a recognised convention with the editors of Ardhamāgadhī and Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī texts to used almost uniformly initial *ṇ* and non-initial *n*, Hemacandra's rule (VIII 1 228-9) is optional, and Dhū shows definite partiality for *ṇ* whether initial or non-initial Perhaps following the MS B, which conforms to the more strict rule of Hemacandra[1], *y-śruti* is not introduced after vowels other than *a* or *ā*, but the text shows many exceptional cases ,for instance *kumdiya* I 58, *daiya* III 48, *duggaiyā* V 92, *dhariya* I 91, *muyaha* IV 71, *suyam* II 51, *hanuyāi* III, 44 It appears that MS A represents a more correct situation, namely, to put *y-śruti* along with the *udvrtta* vowel, *a* or *ā*, irrespective of the preceding vowel, and Jacobi also uniformly follows this rule in his ed of the Samarāiccakahā of Haribhadra

In the absence of separate Nāgarī orthographical symbols for *e* and *o*, as distinguished from those for *e* and *o*, we find that *i* and *u* are easily substituted for *e* and *o* before conjuncts etc , where *e* and *o* are to be pronounced short[2] The point at issue is complicated by the fact that beside the writing of *i* and *u* for *e* and *o*, we must also admit, in some cases the change of these short vowels to *i* and *u* General principles like the weakening at the end, the original Sanskrit formation, and analogy would establish some system and decide a few points Sometimes this gives quite a deceptive appearance to certain nominal and verbal forms etc *ekatah eva* > *ekkatto ccia*>*ikkattu* (also *ekatto=ekkatto?*) *ccia* IV 73, *ettio*>*ittio* I 38, *kumdiāe* I 40 but *gīvāi* I 84 and *Nīlāi* V 11, *Kumtīe* and *Kumtīi* V 11 37, *gotra*>*gotta*>*gutta* V 39, *cakrah iva*>*cakko vva*<*cakku vva* IV 5, *kṣetra*>*chetta*>*chitte*

[1] It has to be noted that Hemacandra himself knew cases which went against his rule, and it is probabl that he is following some grammatical tradition' while the practice even in his own days was to write it u all places irrespective of the preceding vowel

[2] Pischel Grammatic der Prākrit-Sprachen (Strassburg 1900), §84 References to Pischel have the sections of this grammar in view

IV 1-2, *yogya>jogga>jugga* V 78, *donni>dunni* I 81, *peccham>piccham* II 5, 9, *potta> putta* II 44; *bemti>bimti* I 11, *samūho tti>samūhu tti* III 57, *śresṭhī>setthī sitthī* V. 94; *so ceiya>su ceiya* I 94, V 113, *hojja>hujja* I 59, 88, etc

Now and then we come across certain forms which show a change in the quantity of vowel -*ī* of the Present 3rd p sing III 97 IV 6 (cf Samarā p 249, 1 18, p 276, 1 6); *uahi* IV 30, *jia* IV 35, *māria* IV 47, *laya* I 3, -*mmī* of the Loc sing I 4, 23, 36, 51, II 34, IV 37, 88, V 14 78, 112 (usually at the close of a pāda, cf Samarā p 80, 1 12, p 652, last line), *vī* V 17, 32 (also Pauma, 17 12), *sua* III 54, etc All these are due to exegencies of metre rather than being special grammatical forms In this category may be included *aranī* for *aranya*[1] II 31, *tesi* for *tesim* I 6 *kadū* for *kaddū* IV 35, etc , also *bandhassā* for *bandhassa* in Samarā, p 652, 1 17

There are many forms which show that a short vowel followed by an *anusvāra* and the corresponding long vowel get mutually exchanged, in some cases the text itself preserves both the forms *chammāsa* (metrically required) I 52, *chammāsam* I 32, *chammāsā* I 28, 89, *dhāram*, *dhārā* I 28-9, *mukkhattahā* IV 37 (also Paumacariya *kāranaṭṭhā* 5 87), *vahatthā* IV 27, 80, *sakka* III 20, *Sīā* for *Sīam* II 67 (Pauma *jattā kāūna* 5 86), *nivvuī* for *nivvuim* V 51 (see Pauma *uppattī* 1 38, *nivvuī* 5 124, *raī* 6 240), *vilavamānī* V 100, *sitthī* for *sitthim* V 99, *bhamū* III 20 The Abl sing of mas and neu in -*am*, noted by Alsdorf[2] in the Vasudevahindī, appears to me a similar case in which -*am* and -*ā* are being interchanged The Paumacariya gives plenty of such cases I have noted only a few This exchange has not resulted from any defective writing Both of them have the same metrical value and phonetic quantity, and they mutually alternate as a purely phonetic variant This interchange is not sporadic just affecting a few forms of our text It appears to have been a regular phenomenon which has left its influence on the different aspects of Middle Indo-Aryan[3] Once we accept it, many strange words and forms (besides those noted above) get easily explained, for instance, *samrakkhana and sārakkhana, simha and sīha, mamsa and māsa,* in Pāli *vāgīśa and vamgīsa, sanātana and sanamtana,* etc Probably this has arisen out of uncertain pronunciation of a short vowel followed by an *anusvāra*

Intervocalic *g* is not only retained sometime *jage* IV 43, *nāge* IV 46, *sāgara* III 75, also *sāyara* IV 27, but *k* also in softened to *g* *egāgmā* IV 31, *kamalāgara* V 53, ect Intervocalic *d* is retained in some cases *udara* III 85, *udahā* IV 89, *tilloda* IV 21, also *tilloā* IV 7

Instances like *ten'ayagarena* V 67, *divas'avasane* IV 9, *Bhārah'avayāra-kāle* I 82 illustrate Jacobi's rule[4] of dropping of the final *a* of the first word when followed by a even when in turn followed by a short syllable As typical Samdhis we might note *asti+esa= atthesa* IV 14, *rtusnātā>uunhāyā>unhāyā* V 8

[1] For the change of *y* to *i*, compare *a(b)bhvantara>abbhimtara*, *ma(d)dhyama>majjhima*

[2] See his paper 'The Vasudevahiṇḍī, a specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī, Bulletin of the School of O Studies, Vol VIII, parts 2 and 3

[3] Consult also Pischel's Grammatik §§ 75, 114, 181 and 339 Dr A M Ghatage has discussed this in his paper 'Linguistic Nature of Prākrit Languages' read at the 11th All India Oriental Conference, Hyderabad He regards it as a case of extension of the original alterance arising from cases where it is due to normal causes

[4] Sanatkumāracaritam (Munchen 1921), Intro p 6

Some of the proper names show some phonetic changes, *Agastya*=*Agatthi* I 63, IV 27, the Sanskrit verse regularly reads *Agastin* 265, *Ahalyā*=*Ahillā* V 33, *Mārkandeya* =*Makkamda* II 31, *Pārāsura* I 63, V 13 (note the v l), *Rāmana*[1] II 62, 68, 71 and rarely *Rāvana* III 93, *Vasistha*=*Visittha* I 63

Some words change their bases **kamamdala** I 32-3, beside *kamamdalu* I 21-3, *Bambhāna* V 116 (also Pauma 5 122), *manasā* I 50, *Khamdavānaī* for *Khamdavānā* IV 14 -- A few words stand without the termination of the subject or object *gammāgamma* IV 85, *gaya-kacchava* IV 61, *-sambhama* IV 81, *hiāhia* IV 85 (for similar cases see Pauma 1 6, 36 etc) —The form *Agatthīnam* is Inst sing , such forms are already noted by Pischel (§ 379) in Ardhamāgadhī, and plenty of them are found in the Paumacariya 12 113, 13 10, 15 20, 16 32 etc A form like *Agatthina* would be quite regular in Apabhramsa *Uvvasīya*[2] V 115 is Gen sing (for such forms cf Tiloyapannatti 1 241, 2 208, etc , also 4 42, the termination for Gen and Loc being the same) Loc sing *kucchimmi* II 41, also *kucchie* II 38 -- Inst sing of *asmad* is *me* III 3, V 21, 32, perhaps *me* is represented by *mi* at V 32, second line Looking at the use of *mi* at II 2 and IV 2, 4, one finds that it is serving the purpose of both *aham* (through Inst sing *me*, with p p p as the predicate) and *asmi* (through the forms *amhi*, *mhi*, *ammi*, *mmi*) Hemacandra is quite aware of such forms, and Pischel has square-bracketed them in the absence of authentic usage Lately Alsdorf[3] has noted such cases from the Vasudevahindi, and it will be seen that the forms of *asmad* have affected analogically those of *yusmad* –At IV 24 *tam* stands for *tvam* Instr sing is *te* I 87, also *tume*

Of the verbal forms we may note a few Present 1st p sing *paribhamami* IV 3, V 51, also *paribhamāmi* III 1, 3rd p sing *tappai* I 55, 59, perhaps from the passive base (also Pauma 9 55) —Imp 2nd p sing *de* V 78, in the light of the available material, its stages of evolution can be shown thus *dehi dehi de-dehi*, naturally then *de* can stand for *dehi* Our text gives a form *ehehi* II 36 (v l *ehe ehi*, perhaps a scribal improvement on *eehi*), and the Paumacariya gives some such forms *hana hana* 69 112, *chehi* 44 53, *e-ehi* 8 174, *thā-thāhi* 45 10[4] The form *suniyasu* I 53 (cf Pauma 38 46 *khamijjāsu*) started perhaps with the passive augment but here in the active sense[5] The lengthening of *i* in *bhanīhāmo* V 3 has parallels in the Paumacariya *vaccīhāma* V 190, *bhavīhāmi* 118 63, etc — *ahesi* VI 33 is to be traced back to Aorist **abhavisit* (Pischel 516 and Hema VIII iii 164) —*peccham* II 5, 9, is apparently used in the sense of the Present 1st p sing —At III 15 *chinna* is used as the base

-um or *tum* is the well-known termination of the Infinitive, but many forms in this text are used with the Gerundive sense *ovarium* IV 2, *kāum* IV 50, *gamtum* I 66, III 40, 43, *chinnium* III 15, *namium* II 9, *sāmattheum* III 9, 28, 56 (cf Pauma 1 10, 2 60, 5 38, etc) The Gerundives with *-ttr* and *-ūna* are available in this text, see I 71, V 43, 48, 87, 102 The form *pimdevi* III 18 is Gerundive, quite usual in Apabhramśa, and parallels area found in the Pauma 11 99, 41 63, 43 48 --There is one usage of the Infinitive *paribhuttum-je* I 45 which deserves special attention *je* is used as a proclitic

[1] Jacobi Bhavisattakaha (München 1918) Intro p 69* line 1

[2] Such forms are found also in the Vasudevahindi as noted by Alsdorf in his paper referred to above

[3] See his paper referred to above

[4] A M Ghatage Repetition in Prākrit Syntax New Indian Antiquary Vol II 1 p 55

[5] See also Hemacandra's Grammar VIII iii 177-8

here Such forms are found in the Paumacariya also ***ghettum-je*** 1 14, ***hamtum-je*** 53 54, ***nāum-je*** 118 62 According to Hemacandra (VIII ii 217) this *je* is merely an expletive for ***pāda-pūrane*** [1]

At III 58 and V 111 *jattena* and *loena* are used in the sense of Loc, so also *-samthirehim* & *-rattehi* either stand for Loc, or even Gen Similar instances are found in the Ācārānga as well It is interesting to note that Apabh has a common termination *-him* in the Instr and Loc pl Locl for Inst *vālaggamte* I 24, 53 (cf Paum 8 42, 94), Loc for Abl *pāesu* II 45, *bāhāsu* I 37, *ūrūsu* I 37 (but *ūrūhim* II 46[2]) — *nāma nāmena* I 7, IV 7, is just a repetition [3] Parallels for it are found in the Mahābhārata (Virāta 2 1), Rāmāyana and Paumacariya 2 8, 21 In the Pauma (41 46) and Vasudeva-hindī (p 12) *nama* is suffixed to the proper name, *Aggikeu-nāmo*, *Jambu-nāmo* and these are later on again followed by *nāmena* —One feels from *gui viva* II 34, *limda viva* V 120 that perhaps *viva* is being used for *vat*

The dialect used by Haribhadra has much common with that of Paumacariya, and some of the traits have definite stamp of antiquity in the evolution of Prākrits In view of its inheritance of certain Ardhamāgadhī characteristics and its close affinity with the idiom of Paümacariya, we may call it Jaina Māhārāstrī, following the terminology of Jacobi and Pischel

The style of Dhūrtākhyāna, on the whole, is simple and fluent, and quite suited to the conversational tone in which the rogues are carrying on their learned wrangling Haribhadra follows here the epic model, and is addressing an audience of mediocre education and not a learned gathering No artificial attempt is made to embellish the language with poetic ornaments The author's mastery over canonical language has unconsciously introduced expressions like *sannihia-pādihero*, *sannddha-baddha-kavayā* etc (II 6, 10) which remind us of Ardhamāgadhī phrases In descriptions, however, the normal style has not been maintained long compounds are easily introduced in describing the rainy season (I 81), Ganges (I 25 f), Tilottamā (I 62 f, II 29 f), etc The description of the cemetery (V 82 f), though quite dignified as a piece of composition, is not only out of place and proportion, but also conspicuously pedantic in its construction in this small work The first four fantastic tales are remarkably racy in their style, and the handling of expression is quite in keeping with the presentation of events

* * *

My most sincere thanks I offer to Āchārya Jinavijayaji, the learned Editor of the Dhūrtākhyāna in Prākrit, Sanskrit and Gujarāti, who kindly requested me to associate myself with his edition by contributing a critical Essay I had realized the importance of

[1] Some illustrations are already noted from the Paṇhāvāgaraṇaim and Dr Sen has observed thus "The infinitive with *-je* which occurs twice (*ginhium-je* p 122a *ginhium-je* p 113a) occurs in the canon not earlier than in some late gāthā-prakirṇaka A critical Introduction to the Panhāvāgaranāim, Würzburg 1936, p 13 See also Das Mahānisihasutta by W Schubring, Berlin 1918, p 92

[2] Jacobi Some Ancient Jaina Works, Modern Review pp 574-77, December 1914, also his Bhavisattakaha, p 60 of the Intro Ghatage Instrumental and Locative in Ardha-Māgadhī, Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol XIII, No 1, 1931

[3] See the paper 'Repetition in Prākrit Syntax', p 50, noted above

this work a couple of years back, and I gladly welcomed this opportunity of studying the Dhūrtākhyāna which is a remarkable satire in Indian literature My thanks are also due to Dr R N Dandekar, Poona, Dr S K De, Dacca, Dr A M Ghatage, Kolhapur, and Mr K D Pednekar, M A, Kolhapur, who helped me with some books, references and suggestions.

Rajaram College, Kolhapur A N UPADHYE

25-10-1943

THE VARĀṄGACARITA OF JAṬILA*

1 CRITICAL APPARATUS

This edition of *Varāṅgacarita* is based on two palm-leaf Mss that were available; and their critical description is given below

Ka (क) This palm-leaf Ms , measuring 13 5″×2″×2″, belongs to Śrī Lakṣmīsena Maṭha, Kolhapur (No 155, also 195, *Varāṅgacaritra, Saṁskṛta*) It contains 144 leaves (=288 pages), each page has eight lines and each line about 55 letters It is written in Old-Kannada script, and the hand-writing is uniform and fairly beautiful The Ms is well preserved, and is in good order Only one leaf, No 30, is broken across It has some lacunae here and there The copyist is careful, but his copy appears to have inherited some mistakes from the original Now and then intelligent corrections are made in a new hand-writing As it is usual in Old-Kannada Mss , short and long *i*, *u* and *e* are not distinguished Here *dh* and *th* are generally represented by *da* and *ta*, and very often *p* and *y* are interchanged When *r* is the first member of a conjunct group, the other consonant is written as double *vīryya*, *dharmma* etc The three sibilants are often confused, and *l* is usually put for *ḷ*

The Ms opens thus

श्रीमदादिब्रह्मणे नम । निर्विघ्नमस्तु ॥ अर्हंस्त्रिलोक . . . ;

and the concluding passage, at the close of thirty-first canto, runs thus

स्वस्ति श्रीविजयाभ्युदयशालिवाहनशकवर्षे १६५८ नळनामसवत्सरे कार्तिकमासे कृष्णपक्षे चतुर्दशीतिथौ मन्दवारयुक्तायां श्रीरङ्गपत्तनप्रविराजमानश्रीमदादिनाथ श्रीवीरनाथस्वामिपादाम्भोरुहयुग्मसनिधौ श्रीमदभिनवचारुकीर्तिपण्डिताचार्यवर्यानुज्ञया पोमण्णोपाध्यायस्य प्रियपुत्राय अण्णय्योपाध्यायाय पायिसेट्टिपुत्रेण पार्श्वाह्वयेण मया लिखित्वा दत्तमिदं वराङ्गचरितमिति मङ्गलमहा श्री ६ ।

Thus this Ms was written by Pārsva, the son of Pāyisetti, for Annayya Upādhyāya, the son of Pomanna Upādhyāya, with the permission of the contemporary Cārukīrti Panditācārya, at Śrīrangapattana, on Mandavāra, the 14th of the black-half of the month of Kārtika, Śālivāhana Śaka 1658, the name of the year being Nala Śrīrangapattana is the present Seringapatam near Mysore, Cārukīrti is the permanent title of the Bhattāraka of Śravana Belgol Matha, and a salutation to him at the beginning of the fourth canto in this Ms is not without some significance The date corresponds with Saturday, 20th November, A D 1736 So our Ms is 202 years old and comes from Mysore territory This was the first Ms of *Varāngacarita* that I discovered in 1930, and subsequently wrote a detailed paper on it in the *Annals* of the Bhaṇḍarkar Oriental Research Institute, XIV, 61-79

* This is the Introduction of the Varāṅgacarita of Jaṭila It was published in the Manikachandra D Jaina Granthamālā, No 40, Bombay 1938

Ma (म) This is a faithful transcript of the palm-leaf Ms of *Varāngacarit* belonging to the Jaina Matha at Śravana Belgol Through the good offices of Mr N ANANTARANGACHAR the palm-leaf Ms has been lately procured for the Oriental Library Mysore The Ms measures 23½ by 1⅜ inches and the written portion 22 by 1¼ inches It contains 109 leaves written on both sides There are six lines on each side and roughly about 90 letters in each line Every chapter opens with Śrī and a salutation to Vītarāga or some Tirthakara which possibly belongs to the copyist There are lacunae here and there

The concluding lines of the copyist run thus

स्वस्ति श्रीशकवर्षे १९८० बहुधान्यसंवत्सरे मार्गशिरमासे शुक्लपक्षचतुर्दश्यां रविवारयुक्तायां भल्लातकपुराभिधानमहापत्तन श्रीनेमितीर्थेश्वरमहाचैत्यालये मातृकामनतिक्रम्य यथा स्थितं तथैव लिखितम् पुस्तकमिदं लेखकशिरोमणिना ओडयप्पविप्रेण लिखितमिदं पुस्तकं नश्वरं क्षम्यतां बुधैरिति लेखकस्य म॰ प्रार्थना ॥ शुभं भवतु ॥ मङ्गलं चास्तु ॥ भद्रं भूयाज्जिनशासनाय ॥ श्रीनेमिनाथाय नमः श्रीवीरसेनमुनये नम ॥ ॥

Thus this Ms was written and finished by the priest Odayappa who styles himself as *lekhaka-śiromani*, an expert copyist, at Bhallātakapura, on Sunday the 14th day of the bright half of the month of Mārgaśira in the year Bahudhānya, Śaka 1380 Bhallātakapura is the present Gersoppa[1] which is famous for Joag Falls and which, I am told, possesses Jaina cultural relics in the form of typical temples with beautiful images The date corresponds with Sunday, 19th of November, A D 1458 This Ms is 480 years old

I have not handled this palm-leaf Ms, but my readings etc are based on a faithful transcript of it kindly supplied to me by Pt N ANANTARANGACHAR of the Oriental Library, Mysore

Some more details about Ma and Ka may be noted here These Mss show a tendency of retaining *visarga* before *k* and *p* where ordinarily it is changed to s Both of them read *sanmāna* for *sammāna* In canto xxvi, verse No 65 is found only in Ka, and verse No 76, the same as No 81 below, only in Ma In three places arrangement of lines into stanzas possibly due to the loss of some line or lines, is much confused (i) Between vii 18 and vii 23 there should be in all sixteen lines, but both the Mss have only fourteen lines distributed over three verses Ka puts six lines in No 21 and Ma also shows nearly the same arrangement though two lines are left without numbering after No 21 It is impossible to construe the verses as they stand so I have shown blank space for lines 3 and 4 in No 19 and then distributed the remaining lines (ii) In both the Mss there are only eleven lines between xx 2 and xx 6 Nos 3 and 4 have four lines each, while No 5 has only three This arrangement is syntactically impossible and gives no sense I have shown however, the 4th line of No 3 as blank which makes the position quite clear (iii) Some two lines being lost somewhere the arrangement of verses xxiv 63-72 is much unsatisfactory In verse No 70 Ka has only two lines *svapurārjita varnayanti*, while Ma has only two in No 71 *bahukoti praśasti* A close study of this portion tempted me to keep the first two lines of No 64 blank and then assign the remaining lines to different verses

[1] R NARASIMHACHARYA *Karnātaka Kavicarite*, Vol II, p 228

There are many identical lacunae in both the Mss, for instance i 62, 70, vi 54, xvi 72, xvii 76, 78, xviii 130, xx 27, xxiv 22, 23, 40, xxv 27, 49, xxix 21, xxxi 48 etc In textual accuracy Ma is superior to Ka, but comparatively there are more lacunae in Ma (for instance xiv 98, xvi 72, xvii 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84, 86, xviii 1, 3, 5, xxii 59, 62, xxiv 40 etc), but most of them I could fill by the readings given by Ka Some lacunae in Ka are filled by a subsequent hand, at times even incorrectly For instance in xx 27 there is a gap of two letters, and Ka supplies in the margin a reading *javaih* which is not quite satisfactory, in xvii 76 Ka has no gap as in Ma, but the reading of Ka is far from being satisfactory From the transcript I see that Ma once gives a v l on ix 10, possibly it is from the margin of the palm-leaf Ms The number of cases of Ma filling the gaps of Ka is negligibly small, almost nil

Compared with Ka, Ma is older by 278 years, it preserves better readings, and it contains less scribal errors though the number of lacunae in it is greater Ma was written at Gersoppa and Ka at Seringapatam thus both of them come from Karnātaka They are closely associated with the Jaina Matha at Śravana Belgol in the Mysore territory Ma belonged to that Matha before it was brought to Mysore, and Ka was copied with the permission of the contemporary *Bhattāraka* of that Matha Ka has one verse not found in Ma (xxvi 65), in some places Ka supplies satisfactory letters and words where Ma has gaps (xvii 70, 71 etc), and Ka has many readings quite independent of Ma (see for instance the readings on vi 43, xiii 41, xvi 18, xix 11 etc) These facts are enough to show that Ka is not a direct copy of Ma Then some other points also will have to be taken into account between the two Mss there are many common lacunae as noted above, there are some significant errors in both (see vi 19, vii 13, xii 27, xiii 40, 58, xiv 26, xv 105, xx 71, xxii 69, xxiv 4, xxv 47 etc), at the opening of canto xxx there is a salutational verse in both possibly belonging to the copyist These facts indicate that Ka is not absolutely independent of Ma Under these circumstances I am inclined to believe that both Ka and Ma had a common predecessor in an old Ms some generations back The greater number of lacunae in Ma might indicate that the immediate predecessor of Ma was a faulty Ms being eaten by worms etc It is very difficult to say whether any intelligent copyist has filled the gaps in Ka or in its predecessor

2 TEXT-CONSTITUTION

The editor had to work with the limited material supplied by these two plam-leaf Mss which belong to the same family They are distant members of the same group This limited material too has its own defects Genuine variants as such are very few Most of the divergent readings are like the guesses and the slips of scribes When the text is difficult or obscure the number of readings increases We have more variant readings at the beginning of the work than at the close of it perhaps many novices studied some opening cantos of *Varāngacarita* In philosophical sections, for instance canto xxiv, the text is obscure in many places and baffles one's wits There are many gaps in the text, variants, even though available, are not of much help, and very often both the Mss unite to commit a palpable error The work is pretty old, the Ms tradition is insufficient and defective, and there is no commentary available on this work The text is being edited for the first time, and as such I had no opportunities of availing myself of the suggestions of earlier workers Lastly, no other work of this author has come to

light, a close study of which would have helped the editor to understand the textual peculiarities in a better manner.

Under these circumstances I have proceeded with utmost caution and conservatism. By mutually collating Ka and Ma, many scribal, orthographical and other errors were eliminated. The spelling and other features of the text are presented in a standardised form. Common lacunae are retained. In some cases signs of short and long vowels are added by me in square brackets. When there was a gap only in one Ms., it has been filled by readings supplied by the other. This eclectic method I have adopted, because both the Mss. belong to the same family. When there was a disagreement, I have adopted a convenient reading in the text and relegated the other to the foot-notes. Sometimes it will be seen that meaningless variants are noted with a view that they might be useful to conjecture the correct original. When the text is apparently corrupt, I have put question marks in a few cases. As far as possible I have not trespassed the material supplied by the Mss., and even in keeping myself within that limit I had to use my discretion now and then. When there is an agreement between both the Mss. even on plain errors, I have proceeded thus: the readings are left as they are, but in the foot-notes, within square brackets, I have suggested what might have been the probable original of the corrupt readings. Now and then I had occasions to discuss these corrupt readings with many of my friends who were kind enough to make some suggestions here and there. Such suggestions together with those that occurred to me later and other points which I had to face in settling the text I have included in the Notes at the end. In handling the Mss. material such readings do suggest themselves to anyone from the recognised grammatical, metrical and syntactical needs, from the peculiarities of the script, and from the metathetical, haplographical and other errors to which the scribes are often liable. I may explain a few cases here by way of illustration. In iv. 47 Ka reads *sacalah ksanatah*, and Ma reads *sa ca laksanatah*, but both of them do not mean anything. Taking the sense into consideration and remembering that *c* and *v* could be confounded both in Devanāgarī and Kannada I have suggested (*śaivalah*) as the possible correct reading. In vii. 13 *prakrsta-kārandavaham vasanti* is only a metathetical corruption of (°*kārandava-hamsavanti*). In xii. 27 *drastum naram prāni* is certainly a scribal corruption of (*drastum na randhrāni*) as judged from Nos. 25-6 above. In xx. 71 *nrpatayā* is only a contaminated error for (*prtanaya*), which gives the necessary sense. In xxx. 47 *tato'thā puri vāprasamgāh*, which is found in both the Mss., is decidedly a corrupt reading. Taking into consideration that *p* and *y* are often confused in this Ms. and that *v* could be read for *th*, I have suggested (*tato vāyurivāl-pasamgāh*) which, I think, gives a suitable sense. My emendations in the square brackets and in the Notes are only tentative, and I do not claim them to be final. These suggestions are made more or less to eliminate the errors of copyists and not to improve on the author. As they are put in the foot-notes and separately in the Notes, they do not hinder better suggestions from others. Some of my Śāstric friends suggested to make these corrections freely in the text by relegating the corrupt readings to the foot-notes and to regularise the grammatical irregularities of the text according to *Siddhānta-kaumudī*. But, in view of the antiquity of the work and the insufficient and unsatisfactory character of the material, I have diligently refrained from taking any such steps, which, at this stage, would be a handicap to subsequent workers. I have, however, pointed out some grammatical irregularities in the Notes. Thus, in this edition, I have given a faithful record of the text-tradition from the two available Mss. and presented the text as satisfactorily as it was possible for me within the limitations of the material.

3 AUTHORSHIP OF THE POEM

Both the Mss do not mention the name of the author anywhere Neither in the colophons of various cantos nor in the concluding verses of any canto has the author mentioned his name or any personal details Anything like a praśasti is not found in either of the Mss I have not been able to lay my finger on any significant words in the concluding verses of any canto which might indirectly hint the author's name The two words *viśālakīrti* and *rājasimha* in i 89 do catch our eye, but there is no need of forcing any special significance out of them, because such words do not occur at the close of other cantos

In the absence of any clue from the text, we shall have to search for some external evidence to settle the authorship of *Varāngacarita*

(*i*) Jinasena, in his *Harivamśa-purāna*[1] (A D 783), refers to *Padmacarita* and *Varāngacarita* in these two verses

कृतपद्मोदयोद्योता प्रत्यहं परिवर्तिना ।
मूर्तिः काव्यमयी लोके रवेरिव रवे प्रिया ॥
वराङ्गनेव सर्वाङ्गैवराङ्गचरितार्थवाक् ।
कस्य नोत्पादयेद्गाढमनुराग स्वगोचरम् ॥ I 34-35

Thus in the first verse Ravisena is suggested as the author of *Padmacarita*[2] The second verse is not syntactically connected with the first, and it can be rendered thus 'In whom will not the style of *Varāngacarita*, which is pregnant with sense arouse, with all its factors, deep passion for itself, just in the wise of a lovely damsel who arouses, with all her limbs, deep passion for herself—a damsel whose speech has its purpose done through her excellent limbs?' It is a self-sufficient verse describing only the merits of *Varāngacarita* without mentioning the name of its author[3]

(*ii*) Uddyotanasūri, in his *Kuvalayamālā*[4] (A D 778), has a verse like this

जेहिं कए रमणिज्जे वरंग-पउमाण चरियवित्थारे ।
कह व ण सलाहणिज्जे ते कइणो जडिय-रविसेणो ॥

It is clear from the words *jehim, te kaino* that he is referring to two poets, the authors of *Varānga-* and *Padma-carita*, and their names are to be detected in the phrase '*Jadiyara-*

[1] Māṇikachandra Digambara Jaina Granthamālā, Vols 31-2, Bombay 1930

[2] Ibidem, Vols 29-30, Bombay Samvat 1985

[3] Pt PREMI took these verses together and suggested in his *Vidvadratnamālā* (Bombay 1912), p 43, that Raviṣeṇa had written a *Varāṅga arita* besides his *Padmacarita* Later on in a short article in *Jaina Hataishi* Vol 15, p 104, and in his Introduction to the edition of *Padmacarita* he quoted the verse from *Kuvalayamālā* with its defective readings As I have shown elsewhere (*Annals* of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol XIV, parts i-ii, pp 61-79), the attribution of *Varāṅgacarita* to Raviṣeṇa has to be given up for the simple reason that of the two evidences put forth by him one is insufficient since it does not mention the name of the author at all and the second goes completely against him It gives me great pleasure to note that Pt PREMI, a sportsman-like scholar as he is, has already corrected himself and accepted the view stated above in his Hindi summary of my article which he published in *Jaina Jagat*, February 1933

[4] *Catalogue of Mss in Jesalmere Bhaṇḍārs*, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Vol XXI, p 42

viseno' Pt PREMI wavered on the reading of the first part once he read *Jadiya* and second time *Jaiya*[1] DALAL quotes an extract from *Kuvalayamālā* in his notes on *Kāvya-mīmāmsā* of Rājaśekhara, and he also reads *Jadiya*[2] Taking the names respectively Uddyotanasūri attributes *Padmacarita* to Ravisena and *Varāgacarita* to Jadiya, which appears to be a wrong reading for Jadila, as we see from Dhavala's remark given below

(*iii*) Then Dhavala, in his *Harivamśa* (circa A D 11th century) composed in the Apabhramśa dialect, refers to *Varāngacarita* thus[3]

मुणिमहसेणु सुलोयणु जेण
 पउमचरिउ मुणिरविसेणेण ।
जिणसेणेण हरिवसु पवित्तु
 जडिलमुणिणा वरगचरित्तु ॥

In quite plain terms Dhavala refers to *Sulocana-carita* of Mahāsena, *Padmacarita* of Ravisena, *Harivamsa* of Jinasena and *Varāngacarita* of Jatilamuni Though Jinasena is silent on the authorship of *Varāngacarita*, Uddyotana and Dhavala are unanimous in attributing one to Jatila Now it remains for us to see whether Jatilamuni is the author of our *Varāngacarita* which is completely silent about its author

(*iv*) Cāmundarāya, the commander-in-chief and minister of Rācamalla (A D 974-84) has composed in Kannada prose one *Trisasti-salākāpurusa-carita*, popularly known as *Cāmundarāya-purāna* (A D 978)[4] in which we find a passage like this

नाल्कनेंय कथेयबुदु द्रव्यमु क्षेत्रमु काल्मु भावमु प्रकृतमु तीर्थमु फलमुमेंदु सप्तागमवकुं अवरोळ द्रव्यवेंबुदु जीवाजीवास्रवसवरनिजरबंधमोक्षमेंब तत्त्वमनुळ्ळुदु क्षेत्रमेंबुदु त्रैलाक्यं काल्मेंबुदु अतीतानागतवर्तमानात्मक त्रिभेदमु सुषमदुष्षमादि षड्भेदमनुळ्ळुदु भावमेंबुदु. कर्मगळ क्षयादनुपशमदि क्षयोपशमदिनप्पात्मन पर्याय प्रकृतमेंबुदु जीवादितत्त्वगळ्व्याख्यावुदानुमोदु विवक्षितमप्प वस्तु तीर्थमेंबुद जिनपति चरित फलंबुदु तत्त्वज्ञानं पेदनेय श्रोतृवेंबा जटासिहनद्याचायर वृत्त—

मृत्सारिणीमहिषहंसशुकस्वभावा
 मार्जारकङ्कमशकाजजलूकसाम्या ।
सच्छिद्रकुम्भपशुसर्पशिलोपमानास्ते
 श्रावका भुवि चतुर्दशधा भवन्ति ॥

इंतु प्रशस्ताप्रशस्तात्मकचतुर्दशविकल्पं[5]

The prose passage, it will be seen, is a close paraphrase of *Varāngacarita* i 6-7 and the quotation is the same as the 15th verse of the first canto There is no doubt that Cāmundarāya is writing this portion with the verses of our *Varāngacarita* before him

[1] *Jaina Hitaishi* XV, p 104 and his Introduction to *Padmacarita* p

[2] Gaekwad's O Series No 1, p 124 of the Notes 3rd Ed p 205

[3] *Catalogue of Sk & Pk Mss in C P and Berar* p 764

[4] Published by Karnātaka Sāhitya Parishad Bangalore 1928

[5] I have given this extract from an old palm-leaf Ms belonging to Mr TATYASAHEB PATIL of Nandani which is with me at present The printed text has some different readings here and there

and it is no wonder, if Cāmundarāya was tempted to mention the name of the author of that verse The phrase '*Jatāsimhanandyācāryara vṛttam*' is not found in some of the Mss used for the Ed of *Ādipurāna* of Cāmuṇḍarāya, and so the editors have relegated this phrase to the foot-notes. A palm-leaf Ms of *Cāmuṇḍarāyapurāna* written in Śaka 1427 (A D 1505) has this phrase along with the verse quoted, and I do not see any reason to doubt the genuineness of that phrase Thus the author of the above verse, and consequently of our *Varāngacarita*, is Jatāsimhanandyācārya according to Cāmundarāya's authority Further, I think, this Jaṭāsimhanandyācārya is the same as Jatācārya referred to in *Ādipurāna*[1] (c A D 838) by Jinasena thus

काव्यानुचिन्तने यस्य जटाः प्रबलवृत्तय
अर्थान्स्मानुवदन्तीव जटाचार्यः स नोऽवतात् ॥ I 50.

In a marginal note of a Ms of *Ādipurāna* Simhanandin is given as the proper name of Jatācārya[2] Not only Jinasena refers to Jatācārya but draws a good deal of technical matter from *Varāngacarita* as shown below One is tempted to surmise from the above pieces of evidence that the name of our author was Simhanandi, and he was popularly known as Jatācārya perhaps from his long matted hair, which 'shivered when he was deeply engrossed in his poetic compositions' Cāmundarāya calls him Jatā-Simhanandi possibly to distinguish him from other Simhanandis that flourished before his time Jatila means one who has matted hair, and hence we can identify Jatācārya with Jatila, the latter being the author of *Varāngacarita* according to *Kuvalayamālā* and Apabhramśa *Harivamśa*. Thus in conclusion we can say that this *Varāngacarita* is composed by Simhanandi, alias Jatā-Simhanandi, who was popularly known as Jatila or Jatācārya.

4 JAṬĀ-SIMHANANDYĀCĀRYA

Very little do we know about Jatā-Simhanandi, Jatācārya or Jatila In different centuries there have flourished in Jaina hierarchy many saints and authors bearing the name Simhanandi Taking a resumé of important epigraphic and literary references, we can enumerate at least half a dozen Simhanandis, and about all of them we have got very scanty information (*i*) The most famous Simhanandi, whose name is often mentioned in later inscriptions and who is closely associated with the historical tradition of Karnātaka, is he who helped the two forlorn princes to found the Ganga dynasty sometime in the 2nd century A D or so[3] (*ii*) At Śravana Bĕlgol there is an epitaph of one Singanandi who is assigned to circa Śaka 622 (A D 700)[4] (*iii*) One Simhanandi, possibly belonging to Kānūrgana, is mentioned in some of the inscriptions of the first quarter of the 12th century A D[5] (*iv*) Then one Simhanandi, possibly of the Nandigana[6], is mentioned in some

[1] The text is published with Marāṭhi translation (still incomplete) from Kolhapur, with Hindī rendering from Indore and with Kannaḍa translation (partly) once from Bangalore and once from Mysore

[2] *Collected Works* of R G Bhandarkar, Vol II, p 272

[3] B LEWIS RICE *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p 31, M S R AYYANGAR & B S RAO. *Studies in South Indian Jainism*, p 109

[4] *Epigraphia Carnatica* II No 32

[5] *E C* VII Shimoga No 57, Ibidem Nos 4 & 64

[6] *E C* V Arsikere No 1 etc

of the inscriptions of the last quarter of the 12th century A D It is not unlikely if this reference stands for the famous Simhanandi No 1 noted above (*v*) Further one Simhanandi of Balātkāragaṇa is mentioned in an inscription of A D 1371 which records the death of his pupil.[1] (*vi*) At the time of Śrutasāgara, who flourished about the beginning of the 16th century A D., there was one Simhanandi, a Bhaṭṭāraka of Mālava territory, according to whose advice Śrutasāgara wrote his commentary on *Mahābhiṣeka*[2] (*vii*) Dhavala mentions one Simhanandi who wrote a work on twelve Anupreksās, but we do not know anything about him further[3] The details about various Simhanandis are so scanty that it is often difficult to distinguish one from the other However the facts noted above are enough to show that there were Simhanandis more than one Even today the same name is borne by many Jaina monks, and in order to distinguish one from the other the names of their villages etc are added to their names for instance, Edehalli Candrasāgara, Saragūra Candrasāgara and so forth The name of Simhanandi who played some role in the foundation of Ganga dynasty was quite prominent in Karnātaka tradition, and it is perhaps to distinguish from him that Cāmundarāya calls our author Jatā-Simhanandi

Though his name had lately fallen into oblivion, Jatā-Simhanandi is mentioned with reverence for centuries together in Jaina literary tradition preserved in Sanskrit, Prākrit and Kannaḍa texts According to Uddyōtanasūri (A D 778) *Varāngacarita* is pleasing and its author Jaṭila worthy of respect Jinasena I (A D 783) refers to *Varāngacarita* as perfect and fascinating Jinasena II (*c* A D 838) highly compliments the poetic flash of Jatācārya Dhavala (*c* 11th century A D) mentions Jatila and *Varāngacarita* in good company These verses are already given above

Turning to Kannada literature, Pampa in his *Ādipurāna* (Ed , Mysore 1900) which was completed in Śaka 863 (A D 941)[4] respectfully mentions Jatācārya in this manner

आर्यनुत-गृध्रपिंछा-
चार्य-जटाचार्य-विश्रुतश्रुतकीर्त्या-
चार्य-पुरस्सरमप्पा-
चार्य-परंपरेये कुडुगे भव्योत्सवमं ॥ I 12

We have seen above how Cāmuṇḍarāya (A D 978) is indebted to *Varāngacarita* and gives a quotation from it plainly mentioning Jatā-Simhanandi as its author Nayasena (A D 1112), in his *Dharmāmṛta* (Ed , Mysore 1924-26), refers to Jatā-Simhanandyācārya as an ocean of right conduct and endowed with many merits in the following verse

वर्यर्लोकोत्तमर्मोघिसुवोंडनघरत्युन्नतकोंडकुंदा-
चार्यर्चारित्ररत्नाकररधिकगुणर्सज्जटासिंहनंद्या- ।
चार्यर्श्रीकूचिभट्टारकरवितयशर्मिकर्पेपिंगे लोका-
श्चर्यर्निष्कर्मरेम्मं पोरमडिसुगे संसारकांतारदिंदं ॥ I 13

[1] *E C* VIII Sorab No 199

[2] Māṇikachandra D J Granthamālā Vol 17, p 7 of the Intro

[3] A N UPADHYE *Pravacanasāra* (Bombay 1935) Intro p 39 foot-note 1

[4] For the dates of Kannada authors I have mainly followed *Kavicarite* I-III

Pārśvapaṇḍita, in his *Pārśvanāthapurāṇa* (A.D. 1205), praises the courageous monk Jaṭ-ācārya in the following verse[1] which is somewhat obscure

विदिरपोद्र् तोळेयेने तू-
गिदोळाविदिजिनमुनिप-जटाचार्यंर चे-
यँद् पेंपु गेल्दुदु पस
गेद्लुर्केयेनेनिसि नेगेदुमिगे सोगयिसिदं ॥ I 14.

Janna (A D 1209) in his *Anāntanāthapurāna* (Ed , Mysore 1930) refers to Jaṭā-Simhanandy-ācārya as one who has spread the excellent religion both among the princes and peasants in the following verse.

आचारोचित-संयमोपकरण-व्युत्पादकर् गृध्रपि-
ञ्छाचार्यर् चतुरंगुलोद्गमनरर् धीप्रमर् कोण्डकुं-
दाचार्यर् नृपभृत्यवर्धितसुधर्मर् श्रीजटासिंहण-
न्दाचार्यर् दयेगेय्दर केमगे शुद्धाचारसंपत्तियं ॥ I 13

In verses Nos 14-6 Janna mentions the names of Bhūtabali, Puspadanta, Jinasena, Vīrasena, Samantabhadra, Gunabhadra, Pūjyapāda and Akalanka and the 17th verse is a Tripadi which runs thus

वंगर् जटासिंहणंद्याचार्यादीन्द्र
णंद्याचार्यादिमुनिपराकाणूर्गण-
वंदपृथिवियोळ्गोळ्ळं ॥ I. 17

Janna suggests here that Jatā-Simhanandi belonged to Kāṇūrgana, but this cannot be taken seriously for the following reasons Though the origin and history of this Gana are not satisfactorily worked out, the earliest mention of K(r) ānūrgana, so far as I know, is found in the Bandalike inscription of *c* A D 1074[2] Janna's statement is not a contemporary evidence, because he flourished some centuries later than Jaṭā-Simhanandi We have seen above that one Simhanandi of Kānūrgana is mentioned in an inscription of the first quarter of the 12th century A D From this it is not in any way unlikely that Janna associated Jatā-Simhanandi with Kāṇūrgaṇa Guṇavarma II (*c* A D 1230), in his *Puṣpadantapurāna*, (Ed , Madras 1933), calls Jatā-Simhanandi a *muni-pungava*, i e , a prominent monk ; and tells us that no one could equal him in his pursuit of right path The verse in question runs thus.

नडेवल्लियोळ् तम समं
नडेदारं नडेदरिल्ल गडमेतेर्देयुं ।
नुडियुं नडेदुवो पदुळिके-
येडेगे जटासिंहणंदि मुनिपुंगवना ॥ I. 29.

[1] This verse was kindly supplied to me by Pt D L NARASIMHACHAR from a Ms. of that work in the Oriental Library, Mysore

[2] *E C* VII Shikarpur No 221.

Kamalabhava (*c* A D 1235) in his *Śāntīśvarapurāna* (Ed., Mysore 1912) compliments Jaṭā-Sımhanandı as an outstanding preceptor

> कार्यविदर्हद्रत्या-
> चार्य-जटासिंहनंदि नामोद्दामा-
> चार्यवरगृध्रपिंछा-
> चार्यर चरणारविंदवृंदस्तोत्रं ॥ I 19.

Mahābalakavı (A D 1254) ın hıs *Nēmınāthapurāna*[1] refers to the marvellous ınfluence of the world-famous Jaṭā-Sımhanandı ın the following verse

> वैर्यपरगृध्रपिंछा-
> चार्यर जटासिंहनंदि जगतीख्याता-
> चार्यर प्रभावमत्या-
> श्चर्यमदुं पोगळ्वडुजजंगमसाध्यं ॥ I 14

Besıdes these references mere Sımhanandı ıs mentıoned by Aggaḷa (A D 1189) ın hıs *Candraprabhapurāna* (Ed , Mysore 1901), by Kumudendu (*c* A D 1275) ın hıs *Rāmāyana* (Ed , Kolhapur 1936) and by Nāgarāja (A D 1331) ın hıs *Punyāśıava*, but we have no evıdence to ıdentıfy thıs Sımhanandı wıth Jatā-Sımhanandı ın the absence of the qualıfyıng term Jatā

Kŏppaḷa (Nızam state) was once a famous cultural centre, ıt was held ın hıgh respect by the Jaınas of medıeval Indıa, and to-day ıt ıs a place of great antıquarıan ınterest especıally due to numerous ınscrıptıons ıncludıng that of Aśoka[2] On the hıll Pālkī Gundu adjoınıng Kŏppala, just near the Aśokan ınscrıptıon, we have a paır of foot-prınts, and just below that, an ınscrıptıon of two lınes ın Old-Kannada ınforms us that Cāvayya prepared (ı e , got carved) those foot-prınts of Jatāsınganandı-ācārya[3] It ıs usual wıth Jaınas to commemorate great persons by preparıng foot-prınts lıke thıs especıally on the spot where the monks etc , breathed theır last or where theır last remaıns were consıgned to flames Such spots, often wıth some structure on them, are known as Nısıdı[4] Kŏppala or Kopaṇa was not only a great town but a holy place as well whıch was specıally vısıted by Jaına monks for theır Samnyāsa-marana ı e , the Jaına monks spent theır last days there and voluntarıly submıtted to death The foot-prınts ındıcate that Jatā-Sımhanandı breathed hıs last at Kŏppala I am ınclıned to ıdentıfy our author wıth hım for the followıng reasons The name Jatā-Sımhanandı, whıch dıstınguıshes hım from other Sımhanandıs, ıs there, varıous references to hım ın Kannaḍa lıterature poınt to the fact that he belonged possıbly to Karnātaka, whıch ın the days of Nrpatuṅga, extended from the

[1] Thıs work ıs not publıshed as yet MR D L NARASIMHACHAR kındly sent thıs verse to me from a Ms of that work ın the Orıental Lıbrary, Mysore

[2] N B. SHASTRI 'Kopaṇa-Koppaḷa' ın the *Karnāṭaka Sāhıtya Parıshat-patrıke*, Vol XXII, ııı, pp 138-54

[3] C R KRISHNAMA CHARLU *The Kannada Inscrıptıons of Kopbāḷ*, Hyderabad Archaeologıcal Serıes No 12, Hyderabad 1935 The photograph of the Inscrıptıon ıs reproduced elsewhere ın thıs volume wıth the kınd permıssıon of the Dırector of Archaeology, Nızam's Government (hıs letter No 1399 Dated 22-4-1937)

[4] See my note on thıs word ın the *Annals of the B O R I* Vol XIV, p 264.

ıvērī to the Gōdāvarī, and lastly many prominent saints like Kumārasēna were specially racted to Kopana in their last days, so it is likely that our author also came there for Sallēkhanāmarana

From the above references we can get some glimpses of Jatā-Simhanandi's personality it impressed the later minds Jaṭā-Simhanandi belonged possibly to Karnāṭaka He s endowed with the genius of a poet, and was 'a courageous monk of perfect religious iduct' His was an 'outstanding personality of great reputation' As expected of a na monk, he wandered over different parts of the country and preached religious trines amongst 'princes and peasants' Almost uniformly he is styled as an Ācārya, , the Preceptor who admits and initiates the novices in the ascetic order His status of Ācārya would indicate that he lived a fruitful religious life and passed away, possibly ı ripe age, by observing Sallekhanā at Kopana which was considered to be a holy place, l by his remains he added further to its religious sanctity

5 HIS DATE AND OTHER WORKS

In the light of the references noted above it is not in any way difficult to put a later it to the age of Jatā-Simhanandi Dates of the authors who refer to him are pretty inite Noting them chronologically, Mahābalakavi (A D 1254), Kamalabhava (*c* A D ı5), Gunavarma (*c* A D 1230), Janna (A D 1209), Pārśvapandita (A D 1205) and Nayasēna ɔ 1112) mention his name In the 11th century Dhavala refers to Jatila as well as to *Varāngacarita* In the 10th century Cāmundarāya refers to him and draws a quotation m his work, and forty years earlier than that, ***Ādipurāna*** of Pampa refers to Jatācārya the 9th century Jinasena II praises the poetic flash of Jatācārya in his ***Ādipurāna*** ich was begun about A D 838 In the 8th century Jinasena I refers to *Varāngacarita* ıis *Harivamśapurāna* that was completed in A D 783 and just five years earlier than t, in A D 778, Uddyotanasūri refers to Jatila and also to his *Varāngacarita* From se facts it is quite certain that Jatā-Simhanandi must have flourished earlier than D 778 Thus at the beginning of the last quarter of the 8th century A D *rāngacarita* was a famous work both in the South and the North and both among tāmbāra and Digambara writers To account for this wide circulation of this work l his fame, we shall have to allow some period between Jatila and Uddyotana in view the travelling and transit conditions of early medieval India

It is to be highly regretted that Jaṭila does not refer to any earlier author or work, act we get no definite clue from this work which would put an earlier limit to his age e entire range of Jaina dogmatics was stereotyped much earlier, and there has not been ch advance in later days by way of evolution in the principles etc Many of the earlier ts are lost beyond recovery Under such circumstances one has to be extremely cautious drawing chronological conclusions based on similar passages dealing with dogmatical ails However a few indications may be noted here:

(*i*) The dogmatical sections, viewed as a whole, immediately remind us of ***Tattvār-sūtra*** of Umāsvāti It is quite likely that a preacher like Jatila would freely draw upon tandard work like *T sūtra* and expose the contents in his work The comparison, ich I have drawn below, leaves the impression that *Varāngacarita* presupposes ***Tatt-thasūtra***

(*ii*) *Varāngacarita* xxvi 82-83 closely resemble and remind me of ***Savyambhū-stotra***[1] Samantabhadra Nos 102-3

[1] **Sanātana Jaina Granthamālā, Vol I, Bombay 1905.**

(*iii*) It may be noted that *Varāṅgacarita* xxvi 99 reminds me of *Āvaśyaka-niryukti* I 22[1] The idea expressed in this verse is quite popular and current So one should not insist on direct borrowing

(*iv*) From the following comparison it is quite plain that Jaṭila is closely following some important discussions so nicely set forth by Siddhasena in his *Sanmati-prakarana* (Ahmedabad Samvat 1987) *Varāṅgacarita* xxvi. 52, 53, 54-55, 57-58, 60, 61-63, 64-65, 69, 70-71, and 72 may be respectively compared with *Sanmati* i. 6, i 9, i 11-2, i 17-8, i 21, i 22-5, i 51-52, iii 47, iii 54-55, iii 53 Siddhasena's *Sanmati prakarana* has wielded great influence on many later writers Vīrasena and Jinasena freely quote from that work in *Dhavalā* and *Jayadhavala* commentaries, and Jinasena has paid great compliments to Siddhasena's poetic talents at the beginning of his *Ādipurāṇa* (I 39) It is not unlikely that Jaṭila also has drawn material from *Sanmati* Parallels are so close and significant that there can be hardly any doubt that Jaṭila is following Siddhasena The suggestion that Siddhasena might be indebted to Jaṭila has to be dismissed, for quite apparent reasons, without a second's thought

(*v*) The definition of Sāmāyika given in *Varāṅgacarita* xv 122 is the one which is found in the Sanskrit *Sāmāyikapātha* which is quite popular in the Jaina community, but the author of which is not at all known In some printed editions and in many Mss it is found with *Daśabhakti* Tradition attributes Prākrit Bhaktis to Kundakunda and Sanskrit ones to Pūjyapāda[2] It is probable that Pūjyapāda may be the author of this verse, though it is not unlikely that a verse like this might be older still[3]

The dates of the above authors are not finally settled Samantabhadra can be assigned to *c* 2nd century A D Relative chronology of Jaina authors gives us the impression that Umāsvāti preceded Samantabhadra On the date of Siddhasena there is no agreement between different scholars, the latest period assigned to him is 7th century A D,[4] though *it is quite likely that he flourished a century or two earlier As to the age of Pūjyapāda, he* lived earlier than the last quarter of 5th century A D All these dates are such that they cannot put a definite earlier limit to the age of Jaṭila It appears to me highly probable that Jaṭila's time cannot be put earlier than 7th century A D Taking both the limits into account I conclude, so far as the present material is concerned, that Jaṭāsimhanandi flourished at the close of the 7th century A D

On palaeographic grounds the Kŏppaḷa inscription,[5] which records the name of

[1] *Sanmatiprakaraṇam* (Gujarāta-Purātattva-Mandira, Ahmedabad Samvat 1987), p 756 The idea contained in this verse is quite popular Śrutasāgara in his Sanskrit commentary of *Ṣaṭ-Prābhṛta* (Māṇikachandra D J G, Bombay Samvat 1977) quotes two such verses on pp 25-6

[2] A N UPADHYE: *Pravacanasāra* Intro p 26

[3] *Varāṅgacarita* reads *samyamaḥ śubhabhāvanā* and *sāmāyikam vratam* for the usual *saṁyame śubhabhāvanā* and *sāmāyikavratam*

[4] *Pravacanasāra* Intro p 100 foot-note 4

[5] *The Kannaḍa Inscriptions of Kopbaḷ* (Hyderabad Archaeological Series No 12) by C R KRISHNAMACHARLU is a well edited monograph with the necessary illustrations of Inscriptions etc We earnestly request the Director of Archaeology, Nizam's Government, to bring to light other epigraphic records plenty of which, we are told, are scattered all over the Nizam's territory In this monograph there are some minor errors which may be noted here in the interest of epigraphic studies *Sanyāsanan=nōntu muḍipidar* in line 4 of the Inscription No 2, on p 7, appears to be translated as 'having vowed renunciation' completed (the *vrata*)' but it should be rendered as 'died or ended his life after accepting (the

Jaṭāsiṁganandi with whom I have already identified our author[1]; its Editor opines, 'may be assigned to about 10th century A D' As it is put, it is a proposed conjecture without any attempt at proof Dating by palaeography is bound to be a matter of probability and to make the results definite one has to invoke the aid of other evidences The inference from the characters of the record is not as definite—and this is all the more true in the case of Kannada characters —as the evidence which I have adduced above for the date of Jaṭāsimhanandi[2] As a layman I think that the period of the inscription can be pushed back by a century or two, *ca, cā, vā, pa* etc, are quite similar to those in an inscription of A D 881 from the same locality, *ja* shows some modernness, but other letters can go to a sufficiently early period, I leave, however, this matter to expert epigraphists. If they find that the age of the Kōppaḷa inscription cannot be taken to the 8th century A D. on any account, then here is the alternative either the author of *Varāngacarita* may not be identified with Jatāsimganandi of the inscription, or the place was already famous as the spot of the Samādhi-maraṇa of Jatāsimganandi and after some time a zealous house-holder commemorated the spot by carving the foot-prints and recorded that he carved them The evidences about the age of *Varāngacarita* are so definite and the reasons to identify its author with Jaṭasiṁganandi of the inscription are so probable that I would be inclined to accept the second alternative The wording of the inscription also is quite favourable, because it predominently refers to the carving of the foot-prints *Varāngacarita* is an amateur production, so Jatila might have composed it earlier in his life The probability of the second alternative can be appreciated by supposing that Jatila died in ripe old age and the proposed date of the inscription can be pushed back by a century or two

Besides *Varāngacarita* no other work of this author is discovered as yet. Enthusiastic handling of Sanskrit language, exhibition of learned discourses in and out of time and wide parade of dogmatical details perhaps indicate that *Varāngacarita* is an amateur production of the early career of Jatila when he had just finished his schooling and what he had studied in Jaina texts and other works was still fresh in his mind It is not unlikely that Jaṭila, with his excellent grounding in Jaina dogmatics, might have composed some treatises discussing Jaina principles This conjecture is occasioned by a quotation in *Amrtāśīti*[3] a didactic work attributed to one Yogīndra the verse, which is plainly ascribed to Jatāsimhanandi and which is not found in our *Varāngacarita*, runs thus

> जटासिंहनन्द्याचार्यवृत्तम्-
> तावत्क्रियाः प्रवर्तन्ते यावद् द्वैतस्य गोचरम् ।
> अद्वये निष्कले प्राप्ते निष्क्रियस्य कुतः क्रिया ॥

As long as this verse is not traced in any other work, we should proceed with the hypothesis that Yogīndra is quoting from some other work of Jaṭāsimhanandi, which has not come to light as yet

vow of) Sanyāsa (-maraṇa)' Similar expressions are found in Śravaṇ Beḷgoḷa Inscriptions (*E C* II, Nos 8-9, 17-18, 20, 24-25 etc, of the Revised Ed 1923) On p 9 the Editor, it appears, take Inginīmaraṇa as the name of a place, but it is not correct Inginimaraṇa or Iṅgitamaraṇa is a variety of Sanyāsamaraṇa, and its characteristics are described in texts like *Bhagavatī Ārādhanā of Śivārya* See also Sacred Books of the East, Vols XXII and XLV, Jaina Sūtras Part i, p 72, and part ii, p 176

[1] See p 164 above

[2] Jaṭāsinganandi of Kopbāl Inscription No 6 should not be confused with Śrī-Simhanandi of No, 7 of the same place for the simple reason that the latter has not got the designation Jaṭā

[3] Māṇikachandra D J Granthamālā, Vol 21, p 98, verse No, 67,

6. VARĀNGACARITA : A CRITICAL STUDY

(i) Analysis of the Contents

The work opens with a salutation to Arhat, his Dharma and his omniscient knowledge. Then follows a short discourse on the nature of Kathā-prabandha, the Teacher and the Pupil.

King Dharmasena of the Bhoja family was ruling in Uttamapura on the bank of Ramyātata in the territory of Vinīta. Guṇavatī, who was the prominent queen among his three hundred wives, gave birth to a son who was called Varānga (*i*). Dharmasena in consultation with his ministers married Varānga to ten princesses from great families (*ii*). Once Varadatta, the chief disciple of Arista Nemi, came to Uttamapura, and Dharmasena devotionally waited on him with all the members of the retinue. Varadatta delivered to the audience various religious sermons on the following topics: Dharma and Scripture (*iii*), Karma with its sub-divisions as the cause of Samsāra (*iv*), the World and its dimensions and the hellish existence (*v*), the sub-human birth (*vi*), the human world (*vii-viii*), the celestial grade of existence (*ix*), and Liberation (*x*). On an inquiry from Varāṅga, Varadatta explained Mithyātva and Samyaktva and the prince accepted from him the Anuvratas (*xi*). Later on king Dharmasena appointed Varāṅga as the heir apparent to the throne, which incident gave rise to jealousy in the minds of his step-mother Mrgasenā and her son Susena, who, in their plot, were promised assistance by the minister Subuddhi to procure the throne for Susena after somehow getting rid of Varānga. Subuddhi appeared like a faithful minister, but he was always waiting for an opportunity to overthrow Varānga. Once he trained two horses, one in a proper way and the other in an inverse manner, and arranged the exhibition of his training in such a way that Varānga mounted the inversely trained horse, was carried away into a dense forest, and was thrown off by that rash horse which fell in a well. Wandering like an ordinary man, Varānga faced manifold difficulties in the forests. He escaped from the jaws of a tiger with the aid of an elephant (*xii*). He could escape the grip of a crocodile with the divine help of a Yakṣī who taking the shape of a beautiful damsel tried to tempt him, but to her satisfaction he was firm in his vow of celibacy, i. e., fidelity to wedded life, which he had accepted from the saint Varadatta. Then he was imprisoned by hunters, but soon he was released when he cured their Chief's son who was bitten by a serpent (*xiii*). Once by fighting successfully against Bhillas, he obliged Sāgarabuddhi, the leader of the caravan of merchants, and with him he came to Lalitapura where he lived as Kaścidbhata without disclosing his real name and identity. He stayed there like the son of Sāgarabuddhi and was soon installed as the Head of merchants (*xiv*). This unexpected loss of Varānga caused great sorrow to his father, mother and his wives, who, on hearing the religious discourses of a monk, began to spend their time piously (*xv*). Once again Kaścidbhata made himself famous by giving a crushing defeat to the king of Mathurā, who out of sheer greed and vanity, marched against the king of Lalitapura (*xvi-xviii*). Varānga married the royal princess and got half of the kingdom. He was firm in his fidelity to married life despite the temptations of Manoramā whom he married later on (*xix*). Brother Suseṇa, who was looking after the kingdom of his father, proved very weak, and his father had to invoke the aid of the king of Lalitapura. Varāṅga took this opportunity, gave a crushing defeat to Bakuleśvara who was marching against his father, and entered his paternal town to the joy of all (*xx*). He forgave all his offenders, and requested his father to allow him to conquer fresh territories and to

establish a new kingdom in the construction of which he would have ample scope for his military exploits He founded a new kingdom with the well-planned town of Ānartapura as its metropolis on the banks of river Sarasvatī The old territory he divided amongst various people He enjoyed varied pleasures in different seasons surrounded by his rich harem (*xxi*) In response to the question of his chief queen he described to her the duties of lay-followers, and consequently a temple was built and the images of Jina were erected in a great religious pomp (*xxii-xxiii*) To silence the questions of his ministers, Varāṅga exposed the flaws of heretical schools of philosophy and convinced them of the authority of Jina and his doctrines (*xxiv-xxv*) In order to enlighten the members of the audience, he delivered a lengthy discourse on Jaina dogmatics and mythology (*xxvi-xxvii*) A son Sugātra was born to him by his queen Anupamā One day the sight of a falling star made him indifferent to the world and its temporary pleasures He convinced Sāgarabuddhi and his father that it was the time for him now to enter the ascetic order and perform penances for the attainment of liberation They too were converted to his view and enlightened (*xxviii*) He gave a parting advice to prince Sugātra and entered the order of monks accompanied by his queen in the presence of Varadatta, who gave them many an instruction The prince Sugātra was put on the throne The queens performed severe penances and reached higher worlds Varānga conquered passions etc, gradually subdued the internal and external foes, and attained Sarvārthasiddhi by a meditation of a very high order (*xxix-xxxi*)

(*ii*) A DHARMA-KATHĀ WITH KĀVYA FEATURES

From the outline of the contents noted above it is plain that the threads of the story are not in any way intricate It deals with the life of Varānga who belonged to the age of Neminātha and Krsna Jealousy of the step-mother, wanderings of the hero in the forest and the final restoration of the kingdom these are some points in the story which remind the reader of Rāma's story

In the colophons *Varāngacarita* is uniformly called a *dharma-kathā* which, according to Haribhadra's definition[1] is full of religious topics Though the title Mahākāvya is never used by the author, we find here many of the conventional characteristics of a Mahākāvya[2] The work is divided into Sargas or Cantos It opens with a salutation to *Ratnatraya* consisting of Arhat, Dharma and Omniscience The story belongs to Jaina tradition, Varānga, the hero, being a contemporary of Neminātha, the 22nd Tīrthakara The author plainly tells us that the story illustrates the fruition of four-fold ends, viz, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Moksa (i 22 the Anustubh verse in the colophons and also xxix 36) The hero possesses the necessary virtues Among the descriptions required in a Mahākāvya we find here the descriptions of cities (i 32-45, xxi 32-49, xxiii 48 ff) seasonal pleasures (xxii 9-20, xxiv 4-9), sports and love festivities (ii 89 ff, xix 32-9, xxiv 1-14), sentiment of love-in-separation (xix 40-61), marriages (ii 57-73, xix 12-26), birth and rise of princes (xxviii 1-13), state counsel (ii 14-33, xvi 49-74), embassy (xvi 10 ff), advance (xvii 9-25), battle (xiv 8 ff, xvii 36-86, xviii 1-110) and triumph (xviii 110-30) Various classical metres are used in different cantos which are closed with stanzas composed in metres other than the one used throughout the canto Very often the concluding verses of one canto suggest the theme of the next (iii 63, iv 114, viii 69, ix 62 etc)

[1] *Samarāiccakahā*, p 2 (Bibliotheca Indica No 169)

[2] *Kāvyādarśa* i, 13-20.

Varānga is a hero possessed of great religious virtues Like a true man of the world, he never fails to fulfil his duties as a prince, as a king etc His virtues are tested in manifold adversities, physical and mental, and he overcomes them all like a noble man His fight is twofold external, against the enemies of this world; and internal, against Karmic forces And at last he is triumphant in every respect The number of cantos is thirty-one, though the convention needs that it should not exceed thirty Though different sentiments find place in this composition, it is the atmosphere of renunciation that pervades the whole work.

(iii) Dogmatical details in Varāngacarita

Aśvaghoṣa imports into his works many details about Buddhistic ethics and dogmatics, and in fact he makes no secret of the purpose which led to his adopting the Kāvya form Liberation or Moksa is the highest aim, but this is not realised by many, so he wants to preach this truth in an attractive garb of a poem[1] If it is so in the case of an artist like Aśvaghoṣa, we should not be surprised if a monk like Jatila makes his poem a regular platform for preaching the religious and didactic details Many cantos have been solely devoted to such details, and this would be clear to the readers from the following analysis of the contents of such cantos

Canto iv Karman and its Primary and Secondary types 1-38, their maximum and minimum periods 39-41, the causes of bondage of different Karmas and their fruits 42-104, and the relation between Jīva and Karman etc 105-14

Canto v Figuration and dimensions of the Universe with the three enveloping Winds 1-8, five states of existence 9, the hell and its regions with their dimensions and climatic conditions etc 9-24, the sinners that go to hell 25-29, multifarious tortures in hells 30-101, the illustration of Ksudramatsya 102-3, and the periods of life in different hells etc 104-110

Canto vi Varieties of sub-human birth and the miseries therein 1-32, those that go to sub-human birth 33-37, figuration and the duration of life 38-44, and the families and Yonīs therein 45-53

Canto vii Human birth in Bhogabhūmī 1-13, ten wish-fulfilling trees 14-23, those that go to Bhogabhūmī 24-27, Dāna, its varieties and fruits 28-54, and the physical characteristics and pleasures etc in Bhogabhūmī 55-67

Canto viii Human birth in Karmabhūmī 1-4, rarity of human birth dedicated to religious practices 5-27, description of the demeritorious and meritorious 28-59, and the nature of body and the need of religious life 60-69

Canto ix Heavenly beings and heavens 1-24, those that are destined to go to heaven 25-36, birth, physique, pleasures etc, of the gods 37-54, and their periods of life etc 55-62

Canto x Dimensions and description of Liberation 1-10, those that are destined to go to liberation 11-28, special characteristics etc. of liberated souls 29-42, and the happiness of Siddhas which is developed after the destruction of Karmas 43-64

[1] *Saundarananda*, XVIII, 64

Canto xxvi: Nature of the Substance with its six kinds 1-5; Jīva or Principle of life 6-13, Pudgala or matter 14-22, Dharma, Adharma, Ākāśa and Kāla 23-32, additional remarks on the substances 33-44, Pramāṇa and Naya 45-75; Anekāntavāda or Syādvāda 76-90, and the importance of Right Faith among the three Jewels 91-107

Canto xxvii Time, Numbers etc 1-30, Sixty-three Kāraṇa Mānuṣas 31-32, 16 Manus 32-6, 24 Tīrthakaras 37-39, 12 Cakravartins 40-41; 9 Vāsudevas and 9 Prativāsudevas 42-44, Contemporary Tīrthakaras of the Cakravartins 45-48, the height, period of life etc of Tīrthakaras etc 49-65, the previous celestial regions from which they came and were born as Tīrthakaras 66-70, and their fathers, mothers, donors, places of birth, family, colour, Gotra and the places of liberation 71-94

These nine Cantos have no connection whatsoever with the main current of the story, and the narration of the events is not going to suffer even if these cantos are omitted There is no doubt that Jaṭila introduces these cantos merely to preach the details of Jaina dogmatics These sections exhibit not only his religious zeal but also his extensive study of Jaina doctrines

Varāṅgacarita is not a philosophical treatise but only a Purāṇic Kāvya, so all such discourses are intruders here In some cases it is possible for us to detect the probable sources from which Jaṭila might have drawn his material Many verses from *Varāṅgacarita* remind us of some of the Sūtras from *Tattvārthasūtras* of Umāsvāti *Varāṅgacarita* iv 2-9, 11, 15-23, 24-38, 39-41, 42, 43-44, 49-56, 57-58, 62-65 and 93-103 closely agree with *Tattvārthasūtra* viii 3-6, i 15, i 21-23, 29, viii 7-13 (with *Sarvārthasiddhi*), viii 14-20, viii 1, vi 10, viii 7, vi 11-12, vi 13-4, vi 15-27 respectively Similar parallels can be detected in other cantos as well Some verses agree with the Gāthās of Kundakunda also As shown above many verses from canto xxvi closely follow the gāthās from *Sanmatiprakarana*[1]

Dogmatical details, usually ethical in character, are met with in different contexts of the story Relation between Jīva and Karman and the cause of misery and happiness iii 38-63, Samyaktva and Mithyātva xi 1-34, Suicide denounced xv 63 ff , Nature of Saṁsāra xv 75-105, Dharma consisting of twelve vows and its fruit xv 106-46, Duties of a householder and the importance of Jina-Pūjā and the construction of a temple xxii 27-79, Twelvefold reflection and the nature of Samsāra xxviii 31-56 , Mahāvratas, their Bhāvanās, Samitis, Guptis and twelvefold reflection xxxi 75-98 The introduction of such details testifies to the fact that Jaṭila is predominantly a religious teacher and preacher

(iv) Polemic Discussions

In places more than one Jaṭila shows polemical tendencies. various doctrines of different schools are criticised, and in conclusion the doctrines of Jainism are upheld The text, in such contexts, is much corrupt, and to get at the correct interpretation one has to wait for better Ms material According to different theorists Purusa, Iśvara, Kāla, Karman, Daiva, Graha, Niyoga, Svabhāva, Niyata etc,, are considered as the cause of the destruc-

[1] See p. 166 above.

tion, stability and origination of the world (xxiv 17) Against these one-sided views Jaṭila drives his attack Neither Daiva (? Niyoga) nor Deva can control the affairs of man Oblations etc are really eaten by the crow, and how can a god, who is so much greedy about the sacrifice, fulfil the wishes of others (xxiv 22-27)? As there are so many irregularities and untimely occurrences in the affairs of the world, Kāla cannot be accepted as the controlling agency (ibid 28-30) It is a sheer self-deception to believe that Planets can do good or bad, if they have such a power, how is it that they themselves suffer? If they can do good, how do we explain the facts that Rāma lost his wife, Rāvaṇa lost everything, Bali (n) was punished by Murāri, Kāmadeva was burnt by Pinākin, Maghavan was cursed by Gautama, Dharaṇīsuta (Graharājah) was bound down by Rāvaṇa, and that Sun and Moon are troubled by planets (apparently when their stars were good) (ibid 31-6) It is illogical to accept Iśvara as the ruler of the world (ibid 37) Svabhāva cannot govern everything, for the visible facts in this world do not warrant such a view (ibid 38-40) It is disastrous to accept Niyati as the cause (ibid 41) If Purusa were the cause, all pious acts would be fruitless (ibid 42-3) *Śūnyavāda* would reduce *Vijnapti* to negation, and then what wise man would remain there to uphold negative view (ibid 44-5)? Further the views that everything is momentary or eternal do not stand to reason, because they are not self-consistent (ibid 46-7) The doctrine of *Pratītyasiddhi* too is not warranted (ibid 48-50) The view that all the souls are shaped by Paramesthi is not tenable whether he is all-pervading or occupies a finger, his position is not satisfactory (ibid 51-2) These views are not absolutely valid, but they are partial view-points They become significant when they are evaluated according to and qualified by Anekānta (ibid 60-61) It is the Karman which is responsible for the ups and downs of Ātman in Samsāra (ibid 54 ff, 62 ff)

In canto xxv Jatila wonders how a theist can defend the manifold Gotras, and attacks the distinction of Varna based on birth (1-11) Criticising the priests, he attacks the sacrificial Himsā Harm unto living beings is a great sin That the victim sacrificed goes to heaven could have been accepted, only if the relatives of the priest were sacrificed instead If Vedic sacrifice leads to heaven, one does not know who are to go to hell The followers of Svayambhū (Vālabha) have preached that three years old seeds should be offered as oblation A single false worded Vasu to the seventh hell, and it is such a man who is respected by Dvijas Madhupingala went down to hell due to remunerative hankering (*nidāna*), therefore Vedas which have such associations do not deserve any respect at all If king Krūra went to hell by offending a Vipra, how is it that these priests who are killing so many beasts in sacrifice, do not go to hell? Happiness cannot result by inflicting pain on others (12-27) It is a degradation of Brāhminhood that priests should go to the royal gates like beggars Despite the alleged efficacy of their words and rituals, there are manifold mishaps and miseries in this world Brāhminhood does not depend on mere birth, but it depends on one's being endowed with knowledge, chastity and virtues Through the strength of righteousness and penance Vyāsa, Vasistha, Kamaḷha, Śakti, Udgama, Drona and Parāśara could attain Brāhminhood (28-44) A touch of anything belonging to Śankara is condemned, but Gaṅgā becomes pure by resting on his head If the water of Gangā has a purificatory effect, how is it that her son Bahīem suffered like that at the close of his life (45-50)? Great persons performed penance in certain places, and thereby those spots became holy Kārtikeya performed his penance in Svāmigra (?), Kumārī at the Southern point, Bhāgīrathi became holy due to Bhāgīratha and Kurukṣetra due to Kuru Lakṣmī performed penance at Śrīparvata, Puṣkara at Śrīpuṣkara,

Vrsabha at Kailāsa and Aritta Nemi at Ujjayanta (51-59). In conclusion, with a view, to establish the Āptatva of Jina (86 ff) the author mentions certain objectionable acts and traits of gods like Rudra, Agni, Brahman, Visnu, Indra, Kumāra and Buddha (76-85).

The attack on Kālavāda and other views (xxiv 17 ff), referred to above, reminds us of *Svetasvataropanisad* i 2 and *Sanmatiprakarana* iii 53 Aśvaghosa also refers to these heterodox opinions in his *Saundarananda* xvi. 17 and *Buddhacarita*[1] ix 46-7,48-52 (Svabhāva), 53 (Iśvaravāda), also note xvi 18-27 etc Possibly the Anekāntavāda of Jainism is attacked by Aśvaghosa in *Buddhacarita* xvi 24 Jatila, however, attacks Ksanikavāda, Śūnyavāda and Pratītyasamutpāda of Buddhism, the last of which is explained and upheld by Aśvaghosa in *Buddhacarita* xvi 28-43 The attack on non-Jaina deities breathes the same spirit as that expressed by Pātrakesarī in his Stotra.[2]

(v) Some Details viewed in Contemporary Socio-Political Background

As I understand the implication of his various statements, Jatilamuni holds before us a pretty prosperous picture of Jainism in the South His attack on the heterodox schools of thought is quite vigorous (xxiv 21-53) He denounces quite enthusiastically the various non-Jaina deities (xxv 74-98), the sacerdotal religion of Vedas, priestly rituals (ibid 12-49, 60-70) and the Brāhmanic order of society (ibid 1-11) He taunts the priests how they are often turned away from the royal gates and their burning wrath has no effect whatsoever on the kings (ibid 30-33) He sketches the pictures of gorgeous Jaina temples in which images of precious stone are erected and Pūjās are conducted on a large scale with multifarious rituals (xvi 136 ff, xxii 57 ff, xv 139, xxiii 17 ff) The merit of building temples, erecting images and conducting Pūjās is highly glorified (xxii 46 ff) We are told that scenes from Purānas are painted or carved on the walls of temples, and the picture-scrolls are also referred to (xxii 61 ff, xxiii 93) It is interesting to note that Jatila refers to royal gifts of villages and human services etc, to the temples (xxiii 91)

The facts noted above are not without significance, if they are looked at in the light of what we know about Jainism in the South between A D 650 and 750 which dates roughly circumscribe the age of Jatilamuni who flourished in Karnātaka This period corresponds with the rule of Chālukya dynasty of Bādāmi By about A D 630 Pulikesi II, the conqueror of Harsavardhana, was the most powerful king that had subjected many a neighbouring state[3] He suffered defeat at the hands of the Pallava king Narasimhavarman of Kāñcī in A D 642, but his son Vikramāditya I inflicted a crushing defeat on the Pallavas and restored the fallen fortunes of his family in A D 655 The Pallava opposition was quieted very well by Vikramāditya II in A D 740 In this Chālukya period Jainism was very much patronised and it was gradually gaining influence It was in A D 634 that Ravikīrti, who had acquired the greatest favour of Pulikesi II, built the Meguti temple and recorded the erection of it in the famous Aihŏlĕ Inscription which has supplied definite later limit

[1] I have repeatedly used the model Eds of *Saundarananda* and *Buddhacarita* Parts i and ii (Panjab University Publications) by Dr E H Johnston His excellent introduction to *Buddhacarita*, part ii, which is a monument of deep and critical study, has been of much help to me in my study of *Varāṅgacarita* All my references to the text of *Buddhacarita* are, however, to Cowell's Ed (Oxford 1893) unless otherwise stated

[2] Mānikachandra D J G, Vol 13, pp 100-130

[3] V A Smith *Early History of India* (3rd Ed) p 452 ff, B L Rice *Mysore and Coorg* from Inscriptions, London 1909, C Hayavadan Rao *Mysore Gazetteer*, Vol II, etc

to the age of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi[1] Some villages are granted to the temple at the close of the record Grants to the Jaina community have been made by the later kings also[2]

Kadambas of Banavāsi suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Chālukya king Pulikesi II, and from A D 607 onwards there is a short blank period in the Kadamba history Later on the territory of Banavāsi came under Ālūpa kings Jainism enjoyed a good deal of patronage under Kadamba kings, especially Mrgeśavarman (A D 475-490) and others 'Moreover the state of Jaina temples, the ceremonies that were performed in them as mentioned in some inscriptions, and the liberal grants of the kings to meet the expenses of those ceremonies, show that Jainism was really a popular religion in the Kadamba empire and that there were many people who were worshippers of Jinendra'[3] Jainism was becoming a serious rival of Śaivism, it 'grew unchecked during the supremacy of Kadambas' and 'received fresh stimulus in the time of Rāshtrakūṭas'[4] We do not know the persuasion of Ālūpas, but as the Chālukyas were favourable to Jainism, the religion appears to have maintained its status which it had under the Kadambas even after their fall At the close of the 7th century A D Gaṅgas, who ruled at Gangavādi, appear to have been subordinated by the Chālukyan king Vinayāditya Ganga dynasty was founded under Jaina auspices, and 'Jainism was the state creed in the time of the Gangas, of some of the Rāshṭrakūṭas and Kalachūryas and of the Early Hoysalas'[5]

Going Southwards, we have seen above how in this period Chālukyas and Pallavas were fighting Pallava power was much weakened by the middle of the 8th century A D Under the Pallavas Kāñcī was a famous centre for the Jainas, and the names of great authors like Samantabhadra (c 2nd century A D), Akalanka (c 7th century A D) and others are associated with Kāñci The site of Jinakāñcī (i e , Tiruparuttikunrum) is far away from the present sites of Vishṇu and Śiva Kāñcī, and this possibly indicates that Jainism saw its better days on the soil of Conjeevaram long before Śaivas and Vaishṇavas came to power It was in the days of Sundara Pāṇḍya that Jainism received a decided set-back which continued under the later Choḷas who were of Śaiva persuasion Before this Chola persecution, 'Digambara Jainas and Jaina temples were numerous in both the Pallava realm (Dravida) and the Pāṇḍya kingdom (Malakūta)', 'when Hiuen Tsang, the Chinese Pilgrim visited Southern India in A D 640'[6]

It is in this background of contemporary South Indian history that we have to appreciate the statements of Jatila Even to-day we come across many ancient Jaina temples, some of them converted and some of them in ruins Jatila has rightly appealed to the popular zeal of temple-building The idea of the images of precious stones is not a myth, but at Mūdabidri, Humch etc , we actually see such images carved out of precious stones imported into India from across the seas 'Idol worship and temple building on a grand scale in South India have also to be attributed to Jaina influence'[7] The royal patronage gave Jainas an opportunity for vigorous and propagandistic attack on the tenets of non-Jainas Many ruling kings gave lands and villages to Jaina temples,

[1] *Indian Antiquary* VIII for 1879, p 237 ff

[2] *Studies in South Indian Jainism*, p 111

[3] G. M Moraes *The Kadamba Kula* p 35

[4] Ibidem, p 252

[5] *Mysore and Coorg*, p 203

[6] *Early History of India*, pp 453-54

[7] *Studies in South Indian Jainism*, p. 77.

and Jaṭila refers to the gift of 108 villages which may be an exaggeration of the contemporary practice We have got grants recorded on stone and copper-plates, from Kadamba, Chālukya and other kings As referred to by Jaṭila we find the tendency of carving pictures on the walls as seen in the temples at Mūḍabidri and Haḷebīḍ, and we find wall-paintings in the temple of Tiruparuttikunrum or Jinakāñcī, of course some of them are of much later date. At any rate they indicate the practice The carvings on the outward walls of the temples of Belūr and Halebīḍ or the wall-paintings in the Mīnākṣī temple of Madura or the wooden carvings (representing the scenes from *Rāmāyana*) in the temple of Padmanābhapuram in Travancore show that the practice of representing the Purāṇic scenes in stone, colour or wood was not special to Jainas but was common to South Indian temple art.

(*vi*) Aśvaghoṣa and Jaṭila

Among the luminaries of Classical Sanskrit like Aśvaghoṣa, Kālidāsa and Bhāravi, it is by Aśvaghosa that Jaṭila is much influenced A comparison of *Varāngacarita* with *Saundarananda* and *Buddhacarita* shows many a common point. Aśvaghoṣa as a Buddhist and Jaṭila as a Jaina have much in common Both of them introduced that ascetic outlook on life Aśvaghosa has the philosophy and ethics of Buddhism in the background, while Jatila has those of Jainism the former freely used various technical terms of Buddhism and the latter those of Jainism. Denunciation of body, advantages of human birth, hollowness of worldly pleasures, relation between Dharma, Artha etc , and other topics are discussed from nearly the same point of view by both the authors Both of them have a tendency of giving illustration, possibly with a satirical touch, from Brahmanical mythology (*Saundara* vii 25, *Varānga* xxv. 78 ff) We have seen above how the attack against certain heretical schools is common to both[1] In *Saundara* xiv we get the routine of life prescribed for a Buddhistic monk, similarly the two concluding cantos of *Varāṅgacarita* give a good many details of Jaina asceticism Buddhist Nirvāna is explained in *Sn* xvi, while canto x of *Vc* is devoted to the description of Jaina conception of Moksa. The descriptions of hellish[2] and sub-human tortures are almost alike (*Bc* xiv 10 ff , 22 ff and *Vc* cantos v and vi) There are many common ideas almost similarly expressed (*Sn* iv 9 & 11 and *Vc* xix 37, *Sn* xvi 51 & 66 and *Vc* xxiv 55-6; Bc ii 23 and *Vc* xxviii. 9, *Bc* v 37 & ix 41 and *Vc* xxix 17-19, *Bc* viii 76 and *Vc* xv 47, *Bc* ix 45 and *Vc* xxix 59 ff etc) Aśvaghosa uses the simile of the rising sun on the eastern mount twice (*Bc.* ii 20, x 15), Jaṭila introduces the Eastern mountain in his similes atleast four times (*Vc* ii 69, iii 35, xvii 12 and xxiii 45), and once the simile is worded alike by both (*Bc* x. 15 and *Vc* xvii 12) Aśvaghosa has that famous scene where young ladies are witnessing from the lattices the procession in the street (*Bc* iii 19), Kālidāsa has a similar situation with more details better finished (*Raghuvaṁśa* vii 11), and I think that Jaṭila, in sketching a similar scene (*Vc* xviii 118),perhaps shows acquaintance with Kālidāsa's verse Though verse No 118 is not a quite successful imitation of its predecessors, verse No 119, of which I have not come across any counterpart in *Bc* , is worthy of an artist In Aśvaghosa's story Buddha goes out on the Kanthaka horse, while Varāṅga is carried away by an ill-

[1] See pp 172-73 above

[2] Such descriptions are found in Jaina texts even earlier than Aśvaghoṣa Some of them may have been common to Jainism and Buddhism It is the tendency of introducing such details, which characterises both Aśvaghoṣa and Jaṭila, that may be noted.

trained horse *Varāngacarita* has some grammatical peculiarities common with the works of Aśvaghoṣa as noted below And lastly the title of our work reminds us of *Buddhacarita* [1] All these points taken together give us the impression that Jaṭila had possibly studied the works of Aśvaghosa, whose compositions, in view of the flourishing condition of Buddhism in the South as described by Hiuen Tsang in A D 641, might have been available in Southern India, though the Mss of *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda* known to us belong to Northern India I have not been able to detect any striking similarities between the works of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi and *Varāngacarita*

(vii) Varāngacarita and later Jaina Authors

So far as our knowledge of Jaina literature goes, *Varāngacarita* is one of the earliest Jaina poems in Sanskrit written in a semi-epic and semi-kāvya style *Padmacarita* of Raviṣeṇa was completed in A D 677, perhaps this is the only work which may claim priority, though this point is not yet definitely decided, over *Varāngacarita* so far as Jaina epic poems in Sanskrit are concerned There are many Jaina Purāṇas and Kāvyas in Sanskrit later than *Varāṅgacarita*, but I have not been able to detect Jaṭila's influence on later authors to any appreciable extent It is a matter of surprise that Jaṭila is not mentioned by Vādirāja who pays respect to many early authors in his *Pārśvanāthacarita* composed in Śaka 947 (+78=A D 1025)[2] If the scarcity of Mss is a good indication, we may suppose that *Varāngacarita* did not get much circulation actually, even though the fame of Jaṭila had spread beyond the bounds of Karnātaka Jinasena, whose reference to Jaṭācārya we have already noted above, has drawn upon *Varāngacarita* for a good deal of technical matter which he has produced in his words in *Ādipurāṇa* (c A D 838)[3] For instance compare *Vc* i 6-7 with *Ādi* i 122-24, *Vc* i 10-11 with *Ādi* i 127-30, *Vc* i 15 with *Ādi* i 139, *Vc* i 16 and 14 with *Ādi* i 143-44 Cāmundarāya, we have seen above, has taken some material from *Varāngacarita* Somadeva (A D 959) in his *Yaśastilakacampū* (Āsvāsa vii p 332)[4] quotes a verse with the phrase *bhavati cātra ślokah*, and it is the same as *Varāṅgacarita* v 103

(viii) Grammatical Peculiarities of Varāngacarita

The Ms material at our disposal is limited, the textual tradition of the poem is unsatisfactory, and now and then we come across plain errors of the copyists Under these circumstances it is rather premature to note the grammatical peculiarities of *Varāngacarita* Individual occurrences of striking usages cannot be taken into account, if they are not warranted by meter Leaving full margin for scribal errors etc, I would note only a few salient points here, which, I hope, would be interesting to a student of Sanskrit grammar

Varāngacarita is full of Jaina technical terms many of which with their different shades of significance are not noted in the Sanskrit Dictionaries The meanings of such words,

[1] I am aware of the fact, however, that there is an earlier Jaina epic *Paümacariu* of Vimalasūri Whether *Padmacarita* of Raviseṇa is earlier or later than *Varāṅgacarita* is still to be decided

[2] Māṇikachandra D J Granthamālā Vol 4

[3] See the foot-note No 1, on p 161 above

[4] Ed Nirṇayasāgara Press, Bombay 1903.

however, can be ascertained by referring to standard works on Jaina dogmatics and terminology[1] Some peculiar words which our author uses are *goṇa* vi. 15 'an ox', a word of Prākrit origin, so also *phulla* ii 73, *bhinda* xii 85 and *tumba* xxxi. 32 The word *maithuna* xx 75 and xxv 6, which reminds us of Kannada *maiduna* and Marāṭhī *mehuṇā* is unknown to classical Sanskrit in this sense, and *barkara* xxvii 17 'a goat' is also rare *addhā* xiv 95 'time' is quite usual in Jaina Prākrit texts *tiraśca* for *tiryag* xxiv 66 reminds us of Prākrit *tiriccha* or *tiraccha* The author uses *sampadā* also for *sampad,* see xx 65, 79 and especially xxv. 40 Words like *maḍamba, khēḍa* etc iii 4 often show a Prākritic spelling *krīdakṛtam* xxx 57 is a strange Sanskritisation of *kīyagaḍam*-*krītakṛtam* So most of the above words are either Prākritisms or backformations *sādana* for *sadana* xxi 15 *mṛdvīkā* for *mṛdvikā* xxii 72 and *āvahitā* for *avahitā* xxvii 1, are irregularities perhaps due to metre

There are some words which attract our attention with regard to their genders. *geha* M, i 25, xxi 38, xxii 66, 73, *krodhotthāna* M, iv 68, *jala* M vi 52, *vṛttānta* N., xv 1, *aksata* N, xxii 64. There are other cases like *bhūṣana* M, xiii 66, *cūrna* M, xxiii 30, *cakra* M xviii 55 which either agree with the epic usage or are archaisms, *prāna* xxix 3 is used in the singular The superlative *tama* is suffixed to substantives *vaṇiktama* ii 13, *bandhutama* xix 4 & xx 37, *arthatama* xxix 62, and once the phrase *taratama* is used like an adjective iv 114

Once we have *Balinah* xxiv 33 Gen sg from Bali, either the author takes Balin (usually Bali) as the name or it is a back-formation from Prākrit We get the form *svasārah* xx 90 for *svasṛh* Acc pl *kṛtāntah* is used for Voc sg xv 47, Once *gatīṣu* for *gatiṣu* xxiv 54, we get epic parallels for this, but here it is perhaps due to metre

Many nouns and adjectives are used with the abstractive sense, even though the necessary abstractive suffix or change is absent *adṛśyarūpa* for *adṛśyarūpatva* xiv 20, *gādha* for *gādhatva* xx 24, *utsuka* for *utsukatva* xx 76, *nirāśraya* for *nirāśrayatva* xxi 63, *ananyakīrti* for-*kīrtitva* xxii 31, *nirmala* for *nirmālya* xxv 45, *malīmasa* for *malīmasatva* xxix 98 On the other hand we have also *vicikitsatā* for *vicikitsā* xxxi 69, *śaranyatā* for *śarana* xiii 15, *samvāhanatā* for *samvāhanana* xiii 87, *sukha-duhkhātmaka* for *sukhaduhkha* xxiv 30 Then we have a form *ārogyatā* viii 53, xxiii 20, which is doubly abstract

It passes one's understanding why sometimes the author prefers the strong grade of the feminine form of the possessive suffix *vat* as in *garvavantyah, viśuddhavantyah* i 59, *śrutavantyah* xv 34, *cetanāvantyah* xv 37, *dhairyavantyah* xxviii 105 If these are not scribal errors, they appear to be contaminated by Prākrit usage All these cases can be corrected without spoiling the metre

Our text abounds in various verbal forms some of which deserve our special attention The Padas, Parasmaipada or Ātmanepada, may be noted in the following forms *bhartsayanti* v 94, also note xviii 41, 44, 76, *ādaduh* xiv 59 and *ādadāti* xxiv 58 *mṛgayāmi* xv. 134, *prasavanti* xxiv 29, [*vi*] *kṣarate* xxiv 57 Then forms like *lapate* iv 83, *jiheṣuh* xvii 39, *kampat* xxix 13 etc agree more with the epic usage than with the classical one

The author shows a decided inclination towards the use of Perfect, though the forms of the Imperfect and Aorist are also used Perfect is used even for narrating contemporary

[1] *Tattvārthasūtra* with various commentaries, also *Eine Jaina Dogmatik* by H JACOBI in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, 1906, *Dravyasamgraha, Pravacanasāra* etc Among the reference books the following may be noted *Jaina Gem Dictionary* (Arrah 1918), *Abhidhāna-Rājendra* (in Sanskrit) in seven Vols (Ratlam), *Ardha-māgadhī Dictionary* in four Vols (Indore). *Bṛhat Jaina Śabdārnava* in Hindi in two Vols (Surat) etc

events (ii 11), and once it appears to be used even for the first person (xvi 24) In canto iii verses 19-25, the author has as if a regular exercise for the practice of forming desideratives for which he shows his fondness like Aśvaghoṣa It is a regular habit with him to separate the verb of the perfect from its auxiliary by some intervening word, see for instance ii 50, xi 61-2, 85, xiii 20, xiv 16, xviii 56, xix. 7, 19, xxii 3, 26, xxiii 3, 8, 17, 71, xxviii 79, xxix 25, xxx 67 At xxiii 17 the verb has a preposition in addition Aśvaghosa has some instances of this separation (*Buddhacarita* ii 19, vi 58 and vii 9), and this practice is sanctioned by Kālidāsa (*Raghuvamśa* ix 61 and xiii 36) Pretty frequently *āsa* is independently used as in the Epics, for instance i 46, xx 54, xxi 33, xxx 27 There is one clear case of double preposition *upopaviṣṭa* ii 14, xxiii 73; and *adhyadhiṣṭhita* in xxi 69, may be included in the same category *Upopaviṣṭa* is used by Aśvaghoṣa and it is found in *Rāmāyana* also as I have pointed out in the Notes

The author, it appears, has used many irregular forms *karavāmahe* for *karavāmahai* xxviii 84, (*sasarjuh*) for *sasṛjuh* ii 35, *samnidadhyuh* for *samnidadhuh* x 63, *jaghnitha* for *jaghanitha* xiv 51, *juhuh* for *juhuvuh* xxv 15, *mamarduh* for *mamṛduh* xxx 21, *cicitsavah* for *cicetiṣavah* iii 21, *siśamsavah* for *śiśamiṣavah* iii 23, *samaśnutām* for *samaśnuvānānāṁ* or *samaśnuvatām* iv 114 & v 95, *samvibhājitum* either for *samvibhājayitum* or *samvibhaktum* xxi 58, *susādhayitvā* for *susādhya* xxxi 82 and also note *aviganya* for *aviganayya* xviii 2, *rantvā* for *ratvā* xv 128, xxii 20, *parimanthya* for *parimathya* xxiv 56 and *ācakṣitam* for the usual *ākhyātam* xix 73 are rather rare usages The author shows a tendency, quite normal according to the epic usages, of having a strong grade for the feminine base of the present participle *bruvantyah* v 61, *rudantyah* xv 36, 39 and xix 44 The form *rudantī* is used by Aśvaghosa (*Saundarananda* vi 6, 35 and *Buddhacarita* ix 26 JOHNSTON'S Ed)

Now and then we find that the causal form is used to denote the primitive sense *parīpsayinyah* i 59, *atiśāyayanti* i 27 *vighātayanti* iv 30, *todayanti* v 52, *cūṣayanti* v 85 *saṁślāghayantah* viii 34, *bhikṣayanti* viii 28, *parīkṣayanti* x 11, *prativarṣayantau* xiv 12, *samupāsayantah* xxii 42, also *nirañjitānām* xxvi 41 and sometimes the primitive is used with causal sense *hṛtvā* viii 22, *vyābhāsamānāh* ix 38 and *śamitum* xxix 8

We find that *ut-khan* is used in the sense of *ni-khan* v 48, and *gai* or *ni-gai* is used in the sense of speaking, see for instance xvi 57, xx 42, 80, 83, and xii 11 Quite ingeniously the author uses *niśāmya* and *niśamya* (ii 37) with their different shades of meaning The roots *nṛt* (xiv 4) and *vac* (ii 9 & xxii 53) are transitively used with the cognate accusative, while some gerunds are standing intransitively, for instance *anubhūya* i 60, *adhiruhya* v 83, *nighṛṣya* xiii 1 *Āssva bhavān* is used for *āstāṁ bhavān* at xx 31

In many places the conjunctive *ca* is not rightly placed, see for instance ii 2, iii 36, 47, x 35, xiv 57, xviii 73, xxi 9, xxiii 47 etc Sometimes *ca* or *hi* stands at the beginning of a pāda x. 35, xxvii 56 and xxviii 37 At times both *evam* and *ittham* (ii 48, xx 21) and both *yadi* and *cet* (xvi 68, xix 80, xx 25, xxiv 22, 28) are used The archaic *amā* for *saha* is quite a favourite with the author (ii 57, viii 44, xxiii 6, xxviii 98, xxx 34) He shows a tendency of using the pronominal forms of *tad* etc at times without any definite purpose and at times like a definite article in English, see for instance i 4, viii 36, xi 65, 72, 75, etc. etc Often *sāhva* is used for *āhva* or *upāhva* viii 1, xx 27 Now and then *ka* stands like a *svārthe* suffix xi. 25. xxiii. 30

The author is in the regular habit of using Sāpekṣa compounds which may be tolerated as the sense is not much obscured We have many of them scattered all over the text, see for instance i 39, 46, 53, 69, ii 1 etc Pāṇini's rule *ānan ṛto dvandve* is often violated, see for instance i 59, xx 5, xxi 8, xxviii 60, xxxi 4 and also my notes thereon Quite freely the author puts the possessive suffixes to Karmadhāraya compounds, see for instance iii 58, iv 95, ix 45, xiii 25 etc In some cases he does not use Samāhāra as required by classical convention *hastyśva-yānāni* iii 30, *padāti-haityaśva-rathaih* xvi 31 We may also note forms *savaijayantyah* for *savaijayantīkāh* xviii 18 and *-netroh* for *-netṛkayoh* etc xviii 83 About the sequence of words in a compound expression the author is liable to a good deal of laxity, and in this respect he can be compared with his colleagues in Prākrit literature Some of the important deviations I have noted in the Notes, see for instance viii 18, 40, ix 24, xi 33, xii 72, xiii 1, 31, xvi 31, xvii 51, xxiii 26, 56, xxiv. 49, xxx 3, xxxi 73 etc

The ordinary rules of Saṁdhi are uniformly observed But between the Pādas *a* & *b* and *c* & *d* the author, it appears, does not accept that Samdhi is compulsory We find many such cases which are recorded in the Notes There are a few cases where hiatus is allowed even in the body of a Pāda viii 39*a*, xiv 78*d* xvi 81*a* There are two illustrations of abnormal Samdhi *sukṣetra+ajñah=sukṣetrayajñah* xxviii 42 and *grāme+ekarātram=grāmaikarātram* xxx 45

In xvii 32 *nṛpātmajā* Nom sg stands for *nṛpātmajayā* Inst sg The classical usage requires that the causals of the roots *ad* and *khād* should govern Inst , but here we find that the Acc is used instead v 49, 57 The root *hṛ* with *pra* governs Acc see for instance xiv 31, xvii 44, 61, xviii 70 In i 8-9 the author has illustrated the use of *vinā* with Abl , Acc and Inst Instrumental is used for Acc in xxiii 101, where we usually want *vara-cūrna-vāsān* etc As in the epic usage, *apeta* governs Inst viii 34, vi 51, xvi 50 If the reading is correct, it is a novel usage that Dative is used to convey the sense of 'instead of' *Kāścidbhatāya śriyamesa bhunkte* 'he enjoys glory instead of K ' xviii 126 Then Gen is used for Inst xxxi 86, and for Abl which is necessary for comparison xvi 60 Lastly Loc *tasmin* is used for Acc xiii 63

The usage of *samāna-kartṛkatva* appears to be violated in the use of Gerund vi 53, also note xv 126 which needs some emendation as suggested in the Notes.

Among the numerals used by the author the following ordinals in the colophons of those cantos specially attract our attention *ekādaśama, dvādaśama, trayodaśama, saptadaśama, ekonatriṁśatitama, triṁśatitama* and *ekatriṁśatitama* Also note *caturdaśāni* for *caturdaśa* xxx 4 Some such forms like *ekādaśama, aṣṭādaśama* and *ṣaṣṭama* are found in one Ms of *Saundarananda* collated by Dr Johnston for the edition of that work[1]

Some of the specialities of Jatila are the normal usages of the epics, and now and then they are common to Aśvaghosa and Jatila I do not claim that I have exhausted all the peculiarities Some space is devoted to them, along with the emendations of certain corrupt passages, in the Notes at the end A thorough and statistical study with a better text would reveal many more interesting points Then alone it would be possible for us to discriminate between archaisms, special features representing a distinct grammatical tradition, writer's irregularities and scribal slips

[1] See *Saundarananda*, pp 82, 132 and 142 in the Variants.

(*ix*) METERS IN VARĀṄGACARITA

We may enumerate here the various meters used in *Varāṅgacarita*. In view of the bad text-tradition, there are many defective lines and metrical irregularities. Some of them can be emended as shown in the Notes.

Anuṣṭubh (469): iv 1-112, v 1-108, xv 1-144 and xxvi 1-105. One anuṣṭubh verse forms a part of the colophon and it is repeated at the close of all the cantos. The Anuṣṭubh of Jaṭila does not reach the polish attained in the classical stage. When events are being narrated, the verses are normally regular. But whenever dogmatical enumerations etc., are set forth, they read like prose cut into lines. There are some pādas containing nine syllables iv 7*c*, 14*c*, 109*a*, xv. 104*b*, xxvi, 6*a*, 54*b*, excepting one all of them are enumerative in character, some pādas are metrically defective iv 6*d*, 22*c*, 29*a* etc., and in one place we find a flaw of *yatibhanga* between *c* and *d* iv 31.

Upajāti (1879): a combination of the stanzas of lines of Indravajrā and Upendravajrā with complete Indravajrās and Upendravajrās here and there ii 1-93, iii 1-61, vi 1-53, vii 1-65, viii 1-67, ix 1-60, x 1-62, xi 1-85, xii 1-84, xiv 1-96, xvi 1-109, xvii 1-84, xviii 1-128, xix 1-77, xxii 1-77, xxiii 1-103, xxv 1-96, xxvii 1-92, xxviii 1-106, xxix 1-95, xxx 1-73 and xxxi 1-113. Sometimes there is a hiatus in the body of a line viii 39*a*, xiv 78*d*, xvi 81*a*. In an Upajāti verse there is a Vaṃśasthā foot xiv 24*d*. The last vowel in the word *upaiti* in xvi 30*d* followed by *vyaktim* becomes prosodially long against metre. At xxii 50*d* *tu* becomes long against metre. At xxvii 15*a* one syllable is in excess.

Drutavilambita (89): xx 1-89

Puṣpitāgrā (24): i 69-70, iv 113-4, vii 66-7, xi 86-7, xiv 97-98, xvii 85-6, xxiv 76-77, xxv 97-8, xxvii 93-4, xxviii 107-8 and xxix 96-9. It may be noted that xvii. 85*d* is short by one syllable.

Praharṣiṇī (20): ii 94-5, v 109-10, ix 61-62, xii 85-88, xv 145-46, xviii 129-30 (see the Notes), xxii 78-9, xxx 74-5, xxxi 114-15 (see the Notes).

Bhujangaprayāta (10): vi 54-5, x 63-4, xiii 88-9 and xxiii 104-7

Mālabhāriṇī (77)[1]: viii 68-69 (see the Notes), xxiv 1-75. Canto xxiv is a chapter of philosophical contents which are often obscure, and the text too is not well preserved. There are many lines which are wanting in some syllables, while some have syllables more than necessary. All these irregularities are noted in the Notes and some emendations too are suggested.

Mālinī (12): iii 62-3, xvi. 110-111, xix 78-81, xx 90-91 and xxi 79-80

Vasantatilakā (70): i 1-68 and xxvi 106-7.

[1] Though *Buddhacarita* v 1-78 are in Mālabhāriṇī metre, DR JOHNSTON calls them Aupacchandasika. Is it that he treats Mālabhāriṇī as a stereotyped variety of Aupacchandasika?

Vaṁśastha (165) xiii 1-87, xxi. 1-78 In two places we have Indravaṁśā pādas in a Vaṁśastha verse, see xiii 56*c* and xxi. 20*a*.

From the above analysis it is plain that the favourite metre of the author is Upajāti as in the case of Aśvaghosa As remarked above he does not mind hiatus between *a* and *b* and c and *d* of a verse Often the last syllable of a pāda, though grammatically short, is treated as long for metrical purposes Sometimes hiatus is allowed in the body of a line At xxiv 28*c* a short vowel followed by *kr* is taken as a long vowel

(*x*) Style of Varāṅgacarita

For two reasons it is difficult to evaluate the style of *Varāṅgacarita* with justice: first, the text-tradition is bad and one is faced with many corrupt passages, and secondly the contents are varied in character, major portion of the work being devoted to dogmatical details and polemic discussions We miss here the delicate ideas, exquisite comparisons, subtle polish and smooth handling of Sanskrit language which characterise Kālidāsa In moral earnestness and religious zeal Jatila can be favourably compared with Aśvaghoṣa. Dogmatical details have marred the poetic effect of the work The first canto is dignified in its flow, but this tone is not maintained throughout In narrating the events Jaṭila is quite vigorous, and in moral discourses specially at home In some places the author like a good student, observes the special rules of grammar[1], while we come across many lapses elsewhere Thus as the text stands, it leaves the impression of an amateur production Though his descriptions of the palanquin (ii 53 ff) and temple (xxii 57 ff) are rather extravagant, his battle scenes, quite epical in style, are worthy of any great epic poet Jaṭila, like the South Indian architect, takes delight in working out details and details, and is pleased to repeat scenes after scenes Now and then we come across rhyme (xi 45, xix 38, xxi 80, xxii 57-8 and also 59), alliteration (xv 15), and the repetition of the same syllable to produce a sonorous sound (xxii 7, 21) Here and there we find beautiful verses which testify to the artist and the poet in Jatila[2] We may quote some verses here[3]

xi 66

चलत्पताकोज्ज्वलकेशमाला
प्राकारकाञ्चिः स्तुतितूर्यनादा ।
प्रपूर्णकुम्भोरुपयोधरा सा
पुराङ्गना लब्धपतिस्तुतोष ॥

xviii 14

अन्योन्यदन्तांस्तु बलाद्गजेन्द्रा
उत्पाट्य रोषाद्बिसवत्क्षणेण ।
स्वलोहितार्द्रैरभिजघ्नुरन्यान्
नीराजनायामिव वैरलातैः ॥

[1] *āramati*, i 34, *samavatiṣṭhate*, iv 9, *bhīṣayante*, v 94, *saṁkrīḍamānā*, vi 12 etc

[2] Describing the Ms of *Varāṅgacarita* Hiralal remarks 'It is a Kāvya of high poetic merit (*Catalogue of Sk and Pk Mss in the C P and Berar*, p 689) A friend of mine, a close student of Classical Sanskrit, to whom I had sent the first form of this text, writes to me 'The style of the work is charming It is so melodious that one is reminded of Aśvaghoṣa's verses'

[3] These verses are quoted here with certain emendations suggested in the Notes

xviii 65 मानोन्नतं नावनतं परेभ्यो
दोलायमानभ्रमरावलीकम् ।
शिरः सनाथं विनिपत्य भूमौ
प्रफुल्लपद्माकृतिमादधार ॥

The last verse is worthy of any great poet The author inherits many similes from others, but now and then he has his own similes

xviii 119 वातायनेभ्यः खलु पुष्पवर्षं
वराङ्गनाबाहुलताः सलीलाः ।
प्रचक्षरच्चूर्णरजोविमिश्रं
वातावधूता इव कामवल्ल्यः ॥

xxviii 6 निदाघमासे व्यजनं यथैव
करात्करं सर्वजनस्य याति ।
तथैव गच्छन्प्रियतां कुमारो
वृद्धिं च बालेन्दुरिव प्रयातः ॥

When Jinasena complimented the poetic flash of Jatila, I think that he had such verses in view.

7 FOUR OTHER VARĀNGACARITAS

(i) Vardhamāna's Varāngacarita in Sanskrit

The story of prince Varānga has proved fascinating in later days Vardhamāna composed in Sanskrit verse another *Varāngacarita*[1] This poem is a summary of Jaṭila's work with which it has close phraseological agreements in places more than one, the author only curtails the details of religious sermons and various descriptions, the skeleton of the story remaining the same all the while The incidents and events of the story are narrated in the same order At times proper names are differently spelt Vardhamāna perhaps implies that he has summarised Jatila's work when he says

गणेश्वरैर्या कथिता कथा वरा ।
वराङ्गराजस्य सविस्तरं पुरा ।
मयापि संक्षिप्य च सैव वर्ण्यते
सुकाव्यबन्धेन सुबुद्धिवर्धिनी ॥

Pt Jinadas writes in his introduction to that edition that Vardhamāna's *Varāṅgacarita* is the same as the one referred to in *Harivaṃśa* of Jinasena But this view is not correct and cannot be accepted, because it is proved beyond doubt that Jatila is the author of *Varāṅgacarita* referred to by Jinasena

[1] Edited with Marāṭhī translation by Pt Jinadas, Sholapur 1927

There is no definite evidence as to the date of Vardhamāna who gives meagre information about himself He was a Bhaṭṭāraka belonging to Mūlasamgha, Balātkāragaṇa and Bhāratīgaccha, and he had a title *para-vādi-dantipañcānana* I know of two Vardhamānas The first was the Guru of Dharmabhūṣana, the author of *Nyāyadīpikā.* If this Vardhamāna is the same as the Guru of Dharmabūṣaṇa, then this *Varāngacarita* is composed in the middle of the fourteenth century A D at the earliest, because the date of Dharmabhūṣaṇa is given as *c* A D 1600 by VIDYABHUSHAN[1] and A D 1385 by PATHAK[2] The second Vardhamāna is the author of Humch inscription, and his date is about A D 1530 according to RICE[3] It is important to note that this second Vardhamāna belonged to Balākāragaṇa Under these circumstances this *Varāngacarita* cannot be taken earlier than 13th century A D

From the 13th century onwards the references to either Jatāsimhanandi or his *Varāngacarita* become scarce If it is not an accident, the probable reason might have been that the *Varāngacarita* of Vardhamāna came to be popular It is this work, and not Jaṭila's *Varāngacarita*, which is at the basis of Kannada and Hindī versions noted below.

(ii) DHARANIPANDITA'S VARĀNGACARITA IN KANNADA

There is one *Varāngacarita* in Kannada written by Dharaṇi Paṇdita who flourished about A D 1650 He was a native of Visṇuvardhanapura It is composed in a popular Kannada metre known as Bhāminī-saṭpadi He says that his work is based on previous compositions From the fact that he mentions one Vardhamānayati along with other previous authors, it appears that Vardhamāna's *Varāngacarita* was his authority The Ms of this work noticed by R NARASIMHACHARYA is incomplete containing only eight chapters[4]

(iii) LĀLACANDA'S VARĀNGACARITA IN HINDĪ

Through the courtesy of PT PANNALAL JAINA, Delhi, I received a paper Ms belonging to Lālā Harasukharāyaji Jaina Pustakālaya, Mandira Pañcāyatī, Delhi It is written on Āśvina Śuddha 3, Sunday, Samvat 1905 It contains a metrical Hindī version, in 13 cantos, of the Sanskrit *Varāngacarita* of Vardhamāna noted above From the concluding verses we learn that the work of Vardhamāna, being in Sanskrit, could not be followed by all, and hence there was the need of rendering it into Bhāsā, *i e*, the earlier stage of Hindī At Aṭera, in the territory of Bhadāvara (now in the Gwalior State) there lived a Bhaṭṭāraka Viśvabhūsana by name His disciple was Brahmasāgara of the Agravāla family He went to Girnar on pilgrimage, and on his way back halted at Hindaun where many pious house-holders resided He had a disciple in Pāṇḍe Lālacanda who translated the Sanskrit work into Bhāsā so that all might read it This was not possible for him without somebody's aid for which there arrived an opportunity Nathamala, son of Sobhācanda, of Bilālā Gotra, left Āgrā and came to stay at Hīrāpur and rendered much assistance in the composition of this work The author quite modestly states that he composed this work

[1] *Indian Logic* Mediaeval School, p 54
[2] *Annals* of the B O R I, Vol XII, iv p 376
[3] *E C* VIII, Nagar No 46
[4] *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*, Vol II, p 417 ff.

not to parade his learning, but for merit and for the benefit of other house-holders The work was finished in Samvat 1827, 5th day of Māgha Śukla, Saturday, i e A D 1769, 11th February

Besides *Varāngacarita*, it is reported[1] that Lālacandra composed many other works in Hindī such as *Saṭkarmopadeśaratnamālā* (Samvat 1818), *Vimalanātha-purāna*, *Śikharavilāsa*, *Samykatva-kaumudī*, *Āgamaśataka* and some other books on rituals

(iv) KAMALANAYANA'S VARĀṄGACARITA IN HINDĪ

From a Ms containing 67 pages (7"×11") with eleven lines on each page PT KAMATA PRASAD JAINA, Aliganj, has kindly sent to me some relevant extracts from the Hindī *Varāngacarita* of Kamalanayana of Mainapurī As noted in the concluding colophon, it is a metrical rendering of the Sanskrit work of Vardhamāna

Kamalanayana was a resident of Mainapurī He belonged to Yaduvamśa and Budhela caste, his surname was Nagarābāra and his Gotra was Kāśyapa His grandfather Nandurāma was a prominent Banker of that place, while his father Haracandadāsa was a physician Kamalanayana had an elder brother Ksitipati by name He finished this *Varāngacarita* in Samvat 1872, i e A D 1814, Jyestha Śuddha Paurnimā

[1] *Jaina Hitaishi*, Vol XIII, p. 26

KANARESE WORDS IN DEŚĪ LEXICONS*

It is usual with Prākrit grammarians to divide the Prākrit vocabulary into three distinct sections—*Tatsama*, *Tadbhava* and *Deśya*[1] This classification, it must be noted at the outset, is coloured by their bias that the Prākrit languages are mere derivations from classical Sanskrit and the composition of a Prākrit grammar, according to them, consisted in giving a few rules showing where Prākrit formations deviate from Sanskrit and then *Śeṣam Sanskritavat siddham*[2] So those Sanskrit words which could be imported into Prākrit without any phonetic changes came to be known as *Tatsama* i e *Sanskritasama* Knowledge of Sanskrit was considered to be a preceding factor before the study of Prākrits—so the grammarians did not bother themselves about the explanation of *Tatsama* words, nor was it within their limited scope of Prākrit grammars So words like *Salila*, *Ādambara*, *Ārambha*, *Siddhi* and *Bimba* did not come under their purview It is the treatment of *Tadbhava* words that engrossed their attention Hemacandra opened in this respect almost a new field by thoroughly analysing the then existing Prākrit Literature and carefully noting all irregularities, sometimes even composing special rules for individual words This multiplication of rules in explaining each and every irregular word could have been conveniently saved by giving a list of Sanskrit words and their Prākrit equivalents[3] For philologists interested in studying the vocabulary of modern vernaculars these *Tadbhava* words—*Mamjaro*, *Borī*, *Dāhina*, *Laṭṭhī*, *Pisallo*, *Nhāvio* etc — are of immense importance [4] For *Tadbhava* words we are in a position to give phonetically cognate Sanskrit equivalents The *Deśya* section is more interesting The grammarians admit that the *Deśī* words are not related with Sanskrit words neither phonetically nor metaphorically and they are treated as foreign elements but rendered indigenous by familiarity due to their constant use by classical authors Hemacandra[5] proposes to include those words in his Deśī-nāmamālā (DNM) which are not treated in his grammar (Siddha Hema°) and which have no recognition in Sanskrit Lexicons and further he warns that a Deśī Lexicon is not meant to be a systematic vocabulary of words current in different provincial dialects, the composition of which is almost impossible It must be remarked that Hemacandra has not abided by his definition of Deśī words Sometimes he has fallen short of and at other times he has overshot the mark Prākritists[6] have scrutinized Hemacandra's work and have come to the conclusion that Hemacandra had included some words as Deśī which are really *Tadbhavas* like others given in his grammar To settle whether a word is Deśī or not is often a subjective problem[7] It depends on the individual command on Sanskrit vocabulary So the designation of Deśī should not be extended to any word only as an excuse of one's

* Published in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, XII, iii, Poona, 1931, pp 274-84

[1] See Hem Prk Vyākaraṇa, i 1, Trivikrama's Grammar, Introductory Verse No 6, Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā Introductory Verse No 49, Śubhacandra's Grammar I, i 16 and so forth

[2] That is the final stroke of the most of our Prākṛit Grammarians See Hem iv 448

[3] See Pt Rishikesh Śāstri's Prākṛit Grammar (Calcutta 1883), p 74

[4] These words have their counterparts in Marathi, Hindi and so on

[5] See D N M 3 and 4

[6] See Bhavisayattakahā (G O S) Introduction, pp 65 & c

[7] Bühler's Introduction to his edition of Pāiyalacchī-nāmamālā (P L N M) (Göttingen 1879)

ignorance of the oceanic Sanskrit vocabulary, of the application of the armoury of philological processes and the rules of the newly growing science of Semantics[1], nor should one be so biased as not to give any chance to Dravidian and other languages of claiming a particular word as theirs and to trace every word to Sanskrit somehow or the other When we look at Dhanapāla's Pāiyalacchī Nāmamālā in the above spirit we find the real Deśī words given by Dhanapāla are very few as compared with other *Tadbhava* words given by him The so-called Deśī words often turn out to be *Tadbhavas* according to recognised laws of phonetic corruption Dhanapāla's work is mainly a Pāiya-Nāmamālā (a Prakrit Lexicon) and as such he has every scope to include any number of *Tadbhavas* and hence qualitatively his work is bound to differ from the Deśī-Nāmamālā[2] of Hemacandra The function of Deśī Lexicographers is to analyse the Prākrit-Apabhraṁśa Literature and select only those words which cannot be traced to any Sanskritic or middle Prākritik counterparts phonetically or metaphorically and then give their meaning either settling it from the context, or as received from old teachers (*Gurumukha*) or if possible as current in particular provincial dialect Dhanapāla admits this when he says

Kavvesu je rasaḍḍhā saddā bahuso kaīhi bajjhamti
Te ittha mae raiyā ramamtu hiyae sahiyayānam ‖ 279 ‖[3]

Hemacandra gives many genuine Deśī words and it is necessary to trace their origin however tentative our conclusions might be at present Dr P L Vaidya, M A, D Litt, has published a list[4] of Deśī words from DNM which have been preserved in Marāthī and its dialects Dr Vaidya states in his paper that Pt Todaramall has traced some 100 words to Punjābī and its dialects but that paper is not published The moderate ambition of this present paper is to give a critical list of a few Deśī words, from Deśī Lexicons, which appear to have been taken from Kanarese[5]

Before taking up the topic it would not be out of place to indicate here the relation between Prākrit and Kanarese vocabulary The geographical limits of Kanarese speech were indeed extensive in the middle ages and certainly it is not an exaggeration when Nṛpatunga, (814–877 A D) the author of Kavirājamārga tells us that the Kanarese country extended from the Kāverī to the Godāvarī Prākrit Literature, especially the Jaina Śourasenī, has a pretty history of its own in South India and we have many Prākrit works composed by Nemicandra (9th Century), Devasena and other authors, whose mother-tongue was Kanarese So their Prākritik vocabulary can hardly escape the Kanarese influence Kundakunda (1st Century A D), too has written his works both in Prākrit and Tamila[6] Kanarese was originally only a spoken language and when the Jainas first patronised it in early centuries of the Christian era and wanted to utilize it as a local vernacular through which they could popularise their religion, they found its vocabulary too poor to meet the needs of their philosophical expression They drew upon the Sanskrit

[1] See Dr Vaidya's paper 'Observations on Hemacandra's Deśīnāmamālā', A B O R I, Vol VIII pp 63-71

[2] Published in B S S — but now out of print

[3] See PLNM

[4] J B O R I, Vol VIII, pp 63-71

[5] It is in this paper Dr Vaidya made a suggestion, 'It is however very likely that the old Māhārāṣṭrī might have adapted words from other Indian languages, principally from the Dravidian languages'

[6] See PROF CHAKRAVARTI's Introduction to his English translation of Pañcāstikāya, S B J III

vocabulary but the Sanskrit forms could not suit the Kanarese sound system, so they naturally sought shelter of the rules of Prākrit grammar and after necessary corruptions, they imported these words into Kanarese The Prākritik influence on the growth of Kanarese vocabulary is an independent subject itself which we will be treating in a different paper For the present it is sufficient to say that the Kanarese vocabulary is much indebted to that of Prākrit and at the same time it has given a few words to Prākṛit writers some of whom came from Kanarese countries The voluminous Apabhraṁśa writer Puṣpadanta has completed his Apb Mahāpurāṇa in Mānyakheta[1] (modern Malkheda) in Karṇāṭaka; then Trivikrama the author of Prākrit grammar comes also from Karṇāṭaka, (his preceptor's name is Arhanandi, probably of Nandisaṅgha which was popular in Karṇāṭaka) It is no wonder then if some Kanarese words have entered into Prākrit Kāvyas and they are set down as Deśī words by Lexicographers

Akkā (**अक्का**)- (*Akkā bahinī* DNM 6) In that very sense the word is current in Marāṭhī also But in Sanskrit it means a mother Considering its meaning then the word can be called Deśī Sanskritists have suspected that it is a foreign word—Williams Sanskrit Dictionary Dr Caldwell[2] quotes some Scythian instances where also it means an elder sister 'Lappish *Akke* signified both wife and a grand-mother' Tungusian *Akin*' Finish *Ukko* are very striking parallels 'The ultimate base of all these words' according to Dr Caldwell[3], 'is probably *Ak* old' To us, the word appears to come from Dravidian stock preferably from Kanarese, where too it is a derivation from *Āke* (a demonstrative pronoun meaning she *Ake*, probably dative Sg from *Ā* See Śabdamaṇidarpaṇam (SMD) Sūtra 113, on the analogy of *Anna* (now in Kanarese meaning an elder brother) which is derived from the Sanskrit pronoun *Anya* (other than oneself=brother) For the present we might leave the Scythian affinities and say that the word comes from Kanarese according to the above derivation

Appo (**अप्पो**)-(*appo piā* DNM 6) Indeed a very interesting word Not only that this word is current in all Dravida languages but some of the non-Dravidian vernaculars too have this word Cf Marāṭhī *Appā-Abā* Dr Caldwell gives so many cognate forms from different dialects 'The Mech a Būtia dialect has *Appa* for father, Singhalese *Appā*, the Bhotia *Aba*' Caldwell[4] gives some Indo-European affinities but he has not suggested the original base of *Appo* We wish to suggest that the ultimate base of this word is Sanskritik while the meaning is Dravidian and probably Kanarese It can be traced to *Ātman* through Prākrit *Appā* But how that word came to mean a father? In Kanarese the son is called *Appayya* which is undoubtedly from *Ātmaja* (Skt) The equation would be like this

Ātma-ja=*Appa-yya*=One born from Self (=father) When we remove *ja* the equation remains thus

Ātma=*Appa*=father

[1] मण्णखेड-पुरवर-णिवसंतें—See the concluding portion of his Mahāpurāṇa

[2] All references to Dr Caldwell are to his monumental work 'A comparative grammar of the Dravidian languages' 2nd Edition (1875)

[3] *Ibid*, p 454

[4] *Ibid*, p 499 & c

That the son is born from and represents the Self of the father is a current idea Sometimes there is a belief that the father takes birth in the form of his son only retaining his body formally We cannot carry these popular ideas to their ultimate logical issues They are beliefs and not reasonable conclusions In Sanskrit *Ātman* does not appear to have been used for signifying father and hence *Appo*=father is Deśī It is necessary to see whether the ideas noted above are Dravidian or Aryan originally The Dravidians 'appear to have had no idea of "heaven" or "hell", of the "Soul" or "Sin" [1]' Thus it may be suggested that the idea *viz*, the father is the self of the son, may be originally Aryan But Dravidians might have adopted it later and as shown above they went backward from the word *Appayya* and got the word *Appa*=father

Uddano (उड्डणो)-(*Uddano dīha*° I 123 DNM) Compare Kanarese *Udda-nna* *Udda* is from Skt *Ūrdhva* (ŚMD gives *Uccam=uddam*, Sūtra 263) But the termination a (showing possession) and the *āgama* of *na* are Kanarese features of the word

Udū (उडू)-(*Udū Tṛṇaparicāraṇam*, I 86 DNM) It is from the Kanarese √*Udu*=*Vastra-praveṣṭane* (SMD, List of Verbs) The meaning appears to be first generalised and then restricted

Ummallo (उम्मल्लो)-(*Ummallo balātkār iti kecit*, I 131 DNM) Compare Kanarese *Ummaḷa*=heat, grief The Kanarese grammarians want to trace it to Skt *Uṣman* Or *Ud*√*mad*?

Ullī (उल्ली)-(*Chulli Ulli*, I 87 DNM) Cf with Kanarese *ole* *o* is further shortened into *u* Even in Kanarese we find this shortening process *Kodu=Kudu, Todu=Tudu.*

Ūro (ऊरो)-(*Ūro grāmah*, I 143 DNM) Some scholars think that it is a Dravidian word but there is no reason why it should not be traced to Skt *Pura* which is changed to *Ura* when it is a second member of a compound—*Sri-pura=Sirūra* Caldwell[2] gives some Semitic affinities Cf Heb *ār* or *ir* a city Assyrian *Uru* &c

Ūlo (ऊलो)-(*Ulo gatibhangah* I 139 DNM) Compare Kan √*Uraḷ-Uraḷu- Urḷu-Uḷḷu* and now in modern Kanarese √*Uḷḷu*=to tumble *Ulo* (Deśī) is from *Uḷḷu*, the conjunct is simplified and to keep up the quantity the preceding vowel is lengthened

Ettoppam (एत्तोप्पं)-(*Ettoppam etatprabhṛti*, DNM I 144 and also PLN 169 where Dhanapāla has *ittoppam*) Būlher suggests that it is a mutilated form of Skt *etat-prabhṛti* Cf K *Entopp* or *intapp* or *intappa*=of this type, or manner

Okkia (ओक्किअं)-(*Okkiam uṣitam*, DNM I 151) Compare with Kanarese √*okku*= enter, dwell The various stages of the Kanarese form are-√*Puga* (*Praveśé*)-*pukku-okku*

Oppā (ओप्पा)-(*Oppā sānādinā maṇyāder-mārjanam*, DNM I 148) Cf Kanarese *oppu*=polish, glitter, *oppu hāku* is always used with reference to the polish of gems And *oppu-vajjara* means a shining diamond

[1] Dr Caldwell *Ibid*, p 118 of the Introduction

[2] *Ibid*, p 493

Kalī (**कली**)-(*Kali satruh*, DNM II 2) In K *Kalı*=a warrıor, a valiant person—So the Deśī word ıs an ınstance of restrıcted sense

Kāra (**कार**)- (*Kāram katu*, II 26) In K *Kāra*=pungent However there ıs the possıbılıty of derıvıng from Sk *Kṣāra*

Kumḍio (**कुंडिओ**) or **Komdio**- (*grāma-bhoktā*, II 48) Compare wıth K *gaunda* the meanıng gıven by Hemacandra ıs the same as the lıteral meanıng of *gauṇda*=*grāma* +*unda* (√*unnu*=to eat, to enjoy) Thıs word ıs current ın Kanarese ınscrıptıons ın ıts varıous forms (See E C vol I, Mysore Ins No 17) often used as the second member of compound names such as *Deva-gaunda*, at present ıt conveys the same sense as Pātīl

Kuruda (**कुरुड**)-(=*nırdayah*, II 63) Cf K *Kuruḍa*=a blınd man So the meanıng ıs metaphorıcally extended

Kūra (**कूर**)-(=*Bhaktamıtı*, II 43) Compare K *Kūḷ*=Boıled rıce or food, sometımes *Kūru* also ıs used whıch ıs more current ın Tamıḷa Malayālam and Tulu

Kotta (**कोट्ट**)-(=*Nagaram*, II 45) In Skt the word ıs found ın the sense of a fort or castle In Marāthī also the word ıs used ın Sk sense Bombay people always say, *Kota*=fort Caldwell[1] suggests that the word ıs taken ın Sk from Dravıdıan stock where ıt ıs derıved from √*Kut* to be crooked In Kanarese *Kote-kottalgalam* ıs a famous phrase

Koṇo (**कोणो**)-(=*Kṛṣna-varnah*, II 45) Compare K *Kona*=a male buffalo It ıs the specıfıcatıon of the black colour The sea ıs called *Udanvan* where ıts characterıstıc of possessıng 'water' ıs specıfıed

Kolo (**कोलो**) or **Kulla** (**कुल्ल**)-(=*Grīvā*, II 45 and 61) Compare K *Koral-Korl* and the current word *Koḷḷa*

Kamcı (**कंची**)-(=*Musala-mukhe loha-valayam*, II 1) Compare K *Komce*= the encırclıng wall

Khaddam (**खड्डं**)-(=*Śmaśru* II 66) Cf K *Gadda*=*Śamśru* The Kanarese *g* often represents non-Kanarese *kh* for ınstance *Mukha*=*Moga* *Vaıśākha*=*Besıege*

Khodo (**खोडो**)-(=*Khañjah*, II 80) Cf K *Kumṭa-Kūṭa*[2] Very often the Kanarese words have no aspırated consonants for ınstance, *Bhīma*=*Bīma* &c

Cādo (**चाडो**)-(=*Māyāvı*, III 8) Cf K *Cāḍe-Cāḍa*=a male slanderer or defamer Cf Marāṭhı *Cāhāḍa*.

Cikka (**चिक्क**)-(*Alpam vastu*, III 21) Cf K *Cıkka*[3] from *Cıru-Cıga*=*lıttle*, small, young, cf also *Cıkke*=a star

[1] *Ibıd*, p 457.

[2] In Kanarese we find many ınstances of the loss of nasal,—Beṇṭe = Bete, Loṇṭa = Lota etc.

[3] We do not find any Sk counterpart for thıs

Dolā (डोला)-(=*Śibikā*, IV 11) Cf K *Doli-Doli-Dole*=a litter *Dolā* in Sk. means a swing

Nesaro (णेसरो)-(=*Ravih*, IV 44) Cf K *Nesaṛu*[1] (with that old Kanarese spelling *ṛ*) written as *Nesaṛ* also (Cf ŚMD Commentary on Sūtra 193 Where it is said *Taḷa-taḷane nesaṛ-mūḍidudu*)

Tuppo (तुप्पो)-(=*Snigdhah*, V 22) Cf K *Tuppa*=clarified butter This word can hardly be traced to any Sk counterpart. In Tamiḷa we find *Tuppaga*, *tuppu* The Marāṭhī *tūpa* appears to have been taken from Kanarese It is usual in Marāṭhī, when a word is borrowed, to simplify the conjunct and to lengthen the preceding vowel whereby the quantity is maintained For instance *Sapta* (Sk)=*Satta* (Prk)=*Sāta* (M), *Vyāghra* (Sk)=*Vaggha* (Prk)=*Vāgha* (M) Similarly the Kanarese word *tuppa* might have been borrowed and phonetically naturalized

N(N)andī (णंदी)-(=*Go-vācakah*, IV 18) *Nandinī*=a fabulous cow, is current in Sk also Trivikrama also includes this word in his Deśī list (See, his Prākrit grammar Grantha Pradarśinī edition, p 124) In Kanarese this word means an attendant on Śiva and also the *bull* on which he rides Śiva or Iśvara, who is a Nandīśvara because of his riding the bull, is originally a Dravidian god and it is only in latter period that he is admitted into Brahmanic pantheon So the conception of Nandī might also be Dravidian It is interesting to note that Īśvara is called *Kannadiga*[2]

Pālo (पालो)-(=*Jirnah*, VI, 75) Cf K *Pāḷ*=Ruin, desolation In Modern Kanarese it is *Hāḷu*-for the change of *p* to *h* see below under Pāvo

Pāvo (पावो)-(=*Sarpah*, VI 38) Trivikrama includes it in his Deśī list (see p 127 *Ibid*) but he makes an attempt to trace it to Sk like this —*Prāṇi-ghatukatvāt-pāpah* It is an ingenuous suggestion but we should not ignore so flatly the claims of the K counterpart of that word Compare K *Pāvu*, Telagu has *Pāmu* and Tamila *Pāmvu* —all these signifying 'serpent' Modern Kanarese, however uses *Hāvu*—only a corruption from *Pāvu* on the analogy of *Pālu*=*Hālu*, *Pravāla*=*Havaḷa*, *Posa*=*Hosa* and so forth (See ŚMD Sūtra No 258)

Pulli (पुल्ली)-(=*Vyāghrah*, VI 79) Cf K *Puli*=a tiger

Poccaṃ (पोच्चं)-(=*Sukumāram*, VI 60) Cf K *Pocca-Posa-Hosa* (the last two in Modern Kanarese)=fresh

Maṇḍi (मंडी)-(=a cover lid PNM 233) Probably it is the same as the Kanarese word, *Maṇḍi* meaning a wooden saucer, generally used in North Karnātaka

Marulo (मरुलो)-(=*Bhūtam piśācādi*, VI 114) Cf K *Maruḷ*=an evil spirit, an imp, a demon

Muddi (मुद्दी)-(=*Cumbitaṃ*, VI 133) Cf K *Muddu*=a kiss

[1] There is no Sk counterpart for this

[2] For this reference I am indebted to Prof Kundanagar

Roṭṭa (रोट्ट)- (=*Tandula-piṣṭam*, VII 11) In Kanarese we have *Roṭṭi*=bread In Malayālam *Roṭṭi*=a special bread from rice flour and coarse sugar

Vāhali (वाहली)-(=*Laghu-jala-pravāhah*, III 27 Com) It can be derived from the Sk √*vah*, still it may be noted that it has close affinity with K *Hoḷe*=a river

Vilhaṃ (विल्हं)-(=*Dhavalam*, VII 61) It may be traced to the Sk word *Valakṣa* or *Balakṣa*=white from √*val*=to go, however, the relation would be remote But scholars[1] have suspected that even *Valakṣa* comes from the Dravidian stock Slavonic *Veḷi*=white is an important affinity The Deśī form given by Hem appears to be closely related with Kanarese *Biḷe*=white *Beḷḷi*=silver (from its prominent attribute of whiteness), similarly the planet Venus is called *Beḷḷi* in K

Sūlā (सूला)-(=*Veśyā*, VIII 41) Compare Kanarese *Sūḷe*=a harlot, a prostitute According to ŚMD, it is a Kanarese word (See, illustrations on Sūtra 115)

The above list can hardly be claimed as exhaustive and final, it is a maiden attempt of one whose excursions in Kanarese Philology have been few and far between I want to draw the attention of South Indian Scholars better equipped in and more acquainted with Tamila, Telagu, Kanarese and Malayālam vocabularies, and interested in Prakrit philology, to the fact, that their might be many more words (especially Prākrit Dhātvādeśas See Hem VIII (iv) that are passed under the convenient name of Deśī which in the long run can be proved to have been borrowed from Dravidian languages In the present list words like *Nīra*, *Mīna* which have formed a bone of Contention between Sanskrit and Dravidian languages have been intentionally left off I am very thankful to my friend Prof K G Kundanagar, M A, for some of his valuable suggestions in course of the preparation of this article

[1] Caldwell, *Ibid*, p 460

MORE LIGHT ON THE YĀPANĪYA SANGHA[1]: A JAINA SECT*

The religious and ascetic organisation headed by Nigantha Nātaputta, or Mahāvīra, was led earlier by Pārśva, and Mahāvīra was a Pāsāvaccijja, i e , he belonged to the line of Pārśva Still the *Uttarādhyayana*, XXIII, depicts a situation in which the pupils of Pārsva and of Mahāvīra try to patch up some of the differences in their ascetic practices It is such differences that might have created schisms and sects in the Jaina church in due course of time

The *Samāgamasutta* mentions that Buddha had already scented dissensions in the Jaina church soon after the death of Mahāvīra, or Nigantha Nātaputta, and exhorted his disciples not to fall a victim to such schismatic impulses[2] During the life-time of Mahāvīra, the doctrinal differences like the Bahurata started by Jamāli, the son-in-law of Mahāvīra, and Jīvapradesa by Tisyagupta etc , were already there[3] After the Nirvāna of Mahāvīra, possibly due to the migration of certain monks to the South, there arose the division of Śvetāmbara and Digambara by laying more or less stress on certain ascetic practices which must have been there in the church even earlier[4] The schisms started by Āryāsādha (214 years after the Nirvāna of Mahāvīra) etc ,[5] did not survive long to perpetuate any division in the church

From the Mathurā inscriptions of the early centuries it is clear that the ascetic groups like Gana, Kula, Śākhā and Sambhoga were already current in the Jaina church Among the Digambaras there were such division as Sangha (Mūla, Drāvida etc), Gana (Deśī, Sena, Kānūr etc), Gaccha (Pustaka etc) Anvaya (Kundakunda etc) Among the Śvetāmbaras there are Gacchas like Kharatara, Tapā, Añcala, etc [6]

The *Darśanasara* of Devasena (9th-10th century A D) gives a few details about the Sanghas some of which may be noted here The Yāpanīya Sangha was led by Śrīkalaśa (205 years after the death of Vikrama), Drāvida Sangha by Vajranandi (526 years after the death of Vikrama), Kāsthā Sangha by Kumārasena (753 years after the death of Vikrama), and Māthura Sangha led by Rāmasena (953 years after the death of Vikrama)[7] Such divisions, due to differences in practices, were unavoidable, because groups of ascetics lived and moved in different parts of the country

Some definitions of these terms are available A group of three monks was called a Gana, a band of seven monks was designated as Gaccha, and a regular community of monks

* This paper was submitted to the 29th International Congress of Orientalists, Paris, and read by me at the Southeast Asia (Indian) Section on July 17, 1973 and first published in the Annals of BOR Institute, Poona, Vol LV, 1974

[1] For earlier studies see Indian Antiquary VII, p 34 H Lüders E I , IV, p 338, N Premi Jaina Hitaişi, XIII, pp 250-75, A N Upadhye Journal of the University of Bombay, I VI, pp 224 ff , N Premi Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, 2nd ed , Bombay 1956, pp 56 f , 155 f , 521 f , P B Desai Jainism in South India, Sholapur 1957, pp 163-66 etc

[2] Nalinaksh Datta Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and Buddhist Schools, p 200

[3] E Leumann Die alten Berichte von den Schismen der Jaina, I S , XVII, pp 91-135

[4] Dr Hoernle quoted in South Indian Jainism, pp 25-27

[5] See Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya, Gāthās 2304-2548

[6] See the Introduction to Reportoire D'epigraphie Jaina by A Guerinot, Paris 1908

[7] Annals of the B O.R.I , XV, iii-iv, pp 198 ff , Poona, 1934

vas known as Sangha[8]. But these definitions cannot be taken as universal, in fact there re instances of the interchange of Gaṇa and Sangha According to Uddyotana (779 A D) he term Gaccha seems to have originally indicated a travelling group of monks under ts head[9] The traditional meanings have to be collected from the leading monks among Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras

In a Kannaḍa Ms, Ganabheda, more prominence is given to Ganas than to Sanghas. Four Ganas are recognized, and they are linked with certain Sanghas, (i) Senagaṇa Mūlasangha), (ii) Balavatkāra[10] (Nandisangha), (iii) Deśīgaṇa (Simhasangha), and (iv) Kālogragaṇa (Yāpanīya Sangha)[11]

Sufficient attention has not been paid to the Yāpanīya Sangha, partly because there were certain prejudice against the Yāpanīyas, and because they do not exist today under hat name like Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras There are various traditions about the origin f the Yāpanīyas Devasena, who compiled his *Darśanasāra* in the year 909 or 990 years fter the death of king Vikrama, records a tradition that Śrikalaśa a Śvētāmbara monk tarted the Yāpanīya Sangha in the town of Kalyāṇa in the year 205 after the death of ing Vikrama Then Ratnanandi[12] (later than 15th century A D) narrates, in his *Bhadra-āhucarita*, the origin of the Yāpanīya Sangha in this manner King Bhūpāla was ruling t Karahātaka He had a favourite queen Nrkulādevī, by name She once told her eloved that there were her teachers in her paternal town and that they should be requested ɔ come over there for the glorification of the religious rites The king, accordingly, ent his minister Buddhisāgara who brought those monks after great entreaties After ieir arrival the king went forth to receive them in a great pomp, but when he saw them om a distance and found that they were not naked monks, he began to wonder who were iose new monks equipped with clothings, a bowl and a stick He returned home without ffering respects to them, he told his wife that her teachers were heretics, and he was ot ready to respect them, because they were not Jaina monks The queen understood 'hat her beloved meant She hurried to those monks and requested them to give up ieir white clothes and accept the Nirgrantha asceticism They gave up accordingly ieir old robe and went naked with a water-gourd and a bunch-of-feathers Then the ing approached and received them with due decorum The monks, though Digambara i form, continued the practices of Śvetāmbaras, it is they who formed the Yāpanīya angha

The tradition being very late in time, one has to be cautious in accepting it wholesale nd literally There are some implications of this tradition The queen perhaps belonged ɔ the Śvetāmbara community, and the Śvetāmbara monks do not appear to have been ery popular in the South, if this Karahāṭaka were to be identified with modern Karhāḍ in atara district of Maharashtra The Yāpanīyas are looked upon as a Śvetāmbara schism y both Devasena and Ratnanandi, though they had an outward appearance of Digambara ionks

[8] Vasunandi's Sanskrit commentary on the Mūlācāra, IV, 32, Bombay 1920

[9] Kuvalayamālā, p 80, lines 17 f, Bombay 1959

[10] Balavatkārā=Balātkāra, cf Kannaḍa Baḷa(e) gāra

[11] Kālogra-gaṇa seems to be hyper Sanskritisation cf Kaṇḍūra- or Kāṇur-gaṇa which is associated ith the Yāpanīya sangha

[12] Bhadrabāhucharita of Ratnanandi, Kolhapur 1921, Ch IV, 135-54, H Jacobi Uber die Ents-iung der Śvetāmbara and Digambara Seketen, ZDMG, XXXVIII, pp 1-42, H Lüders E I, IV, p 338

Yāpanīyas have been looked upon as a heretic creed by some Digambara writers. Indranandi, in his Nītisāra[13] (verse 10), includes them under five false sects,

> Gopucchikāh Śvetavāsā Drāvido Yāpanīyakah ।
> Nihpiñchasceti pañcaite Jainābhāsāh prakīrtitah ॥

The basic meaning of the term Yāpanīya is a question by itself Various spellings are available for it Yāpanīya, Jāpanīya, Yāpanī, Āpanīya, Yāpuliya, Āpuliya, Jāpuli, Jāvuliya, Jāviliya, Jāvaḷiya, also Jāvaḷigeya Different interpretations are already offered, tracing it back to the root *yā* with the causal suffix TELANG explained the term 'as those who wandered about without being stationary'[14] In early texts like the *Pravacanasāra* (III 10) two types of teachers are mentioned *pavvajjā-dāyaga* and *nijjāvaga* The duty of the *nijjāvaga* is to re-establish a defaulter-monk in the correct behaviour His function is that of controlling and correctly piloting a novice the Sanskrit equivalent should be *nir-yāmaka* rather than *nir-yāpaka*[15] The term *jāvanijja* is used in more than one sense in early Jaina texts In the *Nāyādhammakahāo* there is the expression *iṃdiya-javanijje* Here *javanijje* cannot be from *yāpanīya*, but from *yāmanīya*, going back to the root *yam* to control We may compare also *thavanijja* stands for *sthāpanīya* So yapanīyā is not the correct Sanskritisation, though a catching back-formation So the *javanijja* monks (called Yāpanīya) are those who lead life of *yama-yāma*, compare in this context the *cāujjama-cāturyāma dharma* of Pārśva[16]

It is necessary that we gather some details about the Yāpanīya Teachers, so that we can have a better picture of this sangha and of the teachers associated with it in different localities and contexts of events

The Hāthīgumphā inscription of Khāravela has a reading (uncertain) *Yāpa-ñāvakehi* (line 14) Some suspect here a reference to Yāpanīyas, but one cannot be certain[17]

Mrgeśavarman (475 to 490 A D) of the Kadamba dynasty has given a grant to Yāpanīyas, Nirgranthas and Kūrcakas, the teacher mentioned in the plate is Dāmakīrti Further his son (497-537 A D) also made a grant of a village, out of the income of which the Pūjā etc were to be performed and the Yāpanīya ascetics to be fed for four months The teachers mentioned here are Dāmakīrti, Jayakīrti, Bandhusena and Kumāradatta, possibly all of them Yāpanīyas Further Devavarman, the son of Krsnavarman (475-80 A D) made a donation of a village to the members of the Yāpanīya Sangha in favour of their temple for its maintenance[18]

The Kadaba plates of A D 812 give the following details The Rāshtrakūṭa king Prabhūtavarṣa himself made a donation in favour of a temple presided over by Arkakīrti, disciple of Kūchi (li)-ācārya, who descended from (with a gap of many teachers in between) Śrīkīrti-ācārya of the Yāpanīya-Nandisangha, Punnāga-vṛksamūla-gana Arkakīrti successfully treated Vimlāditya, the Governor of Kuningila Deśa, who was suffering from the evil influence of Saturn[19] The Kiraippākkam (Chingalpet, Tamil Nadu) inscription of

[13] Tattvānuśāsanādi-saṃgrahaḥ, in M D J G , Bombay, Saṃ 1975, pp 58 ff

[14] See I A , VII, p 34, foot-note

[15] See my paper ' On the meaning of Yāpanīya ' in the Śrīkaṇṭhikā, Mysore, 1972.

[16] Otherwise the expression in the Nāyādhammakahāo cannot be properly explained.

[17] E I , XX, No 7, p 80

[18] I A , VI, pp 24-27, VII, pp 33-5

[19] E C , XII, Gubbi 61

c. 9th century A D. refers to a Jına-temple, Deśavallabha by name It was constructed by Amalamudalguru, the pupıl of Mahāvīraguru of the Yāpanīya Sangha and the Kumılagaṇa. The donation makes provısıon for feedıng the monks of the Sangha.[30]

Amma (II) of the Eastern Chālukya famıly made a grant of the vıllage Maliyapundi (ın Andhra) for the benefit of a Jaına temple The teacher ın charge of ıt was Śrīmandıradeva, the dıscıple of Dıvākara and grand-dıscıple of Jınanandı of the Yāpanīya Sangha, (Koṭı) Maduva-gaṇa and Punyāruha (possıbly equal to Punnāgavṛksa) Nandı Gaccha[31] Then there ıs the Saudattı (Sugandhavarttı) ınscrıptıon of A D 980. It opens wıth the mentıon of Taılapadeva of the Chālukya dynasty Śāntıvarma and his queen Candakabbe are specıfied The donatıon of the land ıs made by Śāntıvarma for the Jaına temple buılt by hım Here some of the teachers mentıoned belonged to the Yāpanīya Sangha and Kaṇḍūrgana, and theır names are Bāhubalı-deva (bhattāraka) (who ıs compared wıth moon, lıon etc.), Ravıcandra-svāmı, Arhanandı, Śubhacandrasıddhāntadeva, Maunıdeva and Prabhācandradeva[32] Dr P. B Desaı refers to another ınscrıptıon from Hosur (Saudattı, Dt Belgaum) ın whıch the preceptors belongıng to the Kandūrgana of the Yāpanīya Sangha are mentıoned Theır names are Śubhacandra (I), Candrakīrtı, Śubhacandra (II), Nemıcandra, Kumārakīrtı, Prabhācandra and Nemıcandra (II)[33]

It ıs reported that the ımage of Nemınātha now ın the Dodda Basadı at Belgaum, once belonged to a temple ın the fort The ınscrıptıon on ıt says that Pārısayya of the Yāpanīya Sangha constructed the temple ın A.D 1013 to whıch Kattayya and Jakkavve, the mother of Sāhanādhıpatı (perhaps the same as the Dandanāyaka of the Kadamba ruler Jayakesı) made the gıft of land at Kallahallı (near Gokak) It may be noted that Pārısayya seems to be a layman and not a teacher, and hıs affılıatıon to the Sangha ıs specıfied[34] The Raybag ınscrıptıon (A D 1020) records the gıft of land at Hūvınabāge (mod Raybag) by Dandanāyaka Dāsımarasa to the ıllustrıous preceptor Kumārakīrtıpaṇḍıtadeva of the glorıous Yāpanīya Sangha, Punnāgavrksamūlagaṇa[35] The Hosur (Dharwar Dt) ınscrıptıon of A D 1028-29 records the grant of an arecanut garden and house sıtes made by Āycha-Gavunda of Posavūra to the Basadı Here are mentıoned the Yāpanīya Sangha and (Punnāgyavrksamūla, not fully readable) the teacher ıs Jayakīrtı[36] The Hūlı record ıs found ın two parts, the first belongıng to he Chālukya Āhavamalla Someśvara (A D 1044) and the second to Jagadekamalla (A D 1145) These grants are made for the repaırs of the Jına temple and for the maıntenance of the saınts (connected wıth ıt) In the first Bālacandra-bhattārakādēva of the Yāpanīya Sangha Punnāgavrksamūla ıs mentıoned, and ın the second ıs specıfied Rāmacandradēva[37] The Mugada ınscrıptıon of A D 1045 refers to Yāpanīya Sangha and Kumudıgaṇa It ıs the latter that ıs better specıfied and a number of teachers are mentıoned: Śrīkīrtıgoravadı, Prabhāśasānka, Nayabrtınātha, Ekavīra, Mahavīra, Narendrakīrtı, Nāgabıkkı-vratīndra, Nıravadyakīrtı-bhaṭṭāraka, Mādhavendu, Bālacandra,

[30] A R S I E, 1934-35, No 22, p 10, Delhı 1938
[31] E I, IX, No 6
[32] Journal of the B B R A S, X, 71-72, text pp 206-207
[33] Jaınısm ın South Indıa, p 165
[34] Jınavıjaya (Kannada), Januray 1931
[35] Journal of the Bombay Hıstorıcal Socıety, III, pp 192-200.
[36] S I I, XI ı, No 65, Madras 1940
[37] E I, XVIII, also P B Desaı, *ıbıdem* pp 174 f

Rāmacandra, Municandra, Ravikīrti, Kumārakīrti, Dāmanandi, Traividya Govardhana, Dāmanandi, Vaddācārya Some names are elusive But all of them are highly praised with references to their profound learning and exemplary conduct [28] The Morab (Dt Dharwar) record mentions the Samādhi-marana of Nāgacandra Siddhāntadeva, the pupil of Jayakīrtideva of the Yapānīya Sangha Kanakaśakti was the pupil of Nāgacandra who is called Mantracūḍāmani [29] The Doni (Dt Dharwar) record, belonging to the reign of Tribhuvanamalla (A D 1096), is a grant of a garden to Cārukīrti pandita, the pupil of Municandra-traividya bhaṭṭāraka of the Yāpanīya-sangha-vrkṣamūlagaṇa Dāyimayya, the pupil of Municandra Siddhāntideva, worte the record [30] The Dharmapuri inscription (Dt Bhir, Maharashtra) records the grant of income from different taxes for the worship of god and for the feeding of ascetics by the Pamcapattana of Poṭṭalakere, the Kaṃcugāras and Telunganagaras The grant was entrusted to Mahāvīrā Pandita, the Ācārya of the Basadi, of Yāpanīya sangha and Vamdiyūragana [31] The Kalabhavi record outside the temple of Rāmalinga belongs to c 11th century A D and refers to the period of Śivamāra of the Western Ganga family Śivamāra gifted the village Kumudavāda to a Jain shrine built by him and entrusted it to the preceptor Devakīrti of the Mailāpānvaya, Kāreyagaṇa (which are associated with Yāpanīya sangha in the Bailahongal record) His predecessors mentioned are Śubhakīrti, Jinacandra, Nāgacandra and Guṇakīrti [32]

The Honnur inscription records the grant for the temple built by Bamma-gavuda, the disciple of Rātrimati-kanti, i e, a nun by name Rātrimati, of the Mūlasangha, Punnāgavrksamūlagana at the time of Ballāladeva and Gandarāditya (of the Śilāhāra dynasty of Kolhapur), *c* 1108 A D [33] The Bailahongal (Dt Belgaum) record is of the time of Chālukya Tribhuvanamalladeva The Ratta Mahāsāmanta Anka, Śāntiyakka and Kundi territory are mentioned It is a grant to some Jaina temple Muḷla-bhattāraka and Jinadevasūri of the Yāpanīya sangha, Mailāpa Anvaya and Kāreyagana are specified [34] There is another Hūli (Dt Belgaum) inscription of the reign of Vikramāditya (VI) It refers to Bāhubali, Śubhacandra, Maunideva and Māghanandi of the Yāpanīya sangha and Kandūrgaṇa [35] The inscription at Eksambi (Dt Belgaum) is found in the Neminātha Basadi constructed by Kāḷaṇ(ṇ)a, the general of Vijayāditya (the son of Śilāhāra Gaṇḍarāditya) A land for the temple was given to Vijayakīrti (Mahāmandalācārya) of the Yāpanīya sangha, Punnāgavrksamūlagana His genealogy stands thus Municandra, Vijayakīrti, Kumārakīrti and Traividya Vijayakīrti The Ratta Kārtavīrya paid a respectful visit to this temple in A D 1175 [36] The Arsikere (Mysore) inscription (*c* middle of the 12th century A D) refers to the grant made to the Jina temple In one of the opening verses the Maduvagana of the Yāpanīya (Sangha) is praised The pratisthā of the image was made by Māṇikaśeṭṭi, a disciple of the Poṃnāgavrikṣamūlagaṇa and (Yāpanīya)

[28] S I I, XI, i No 78, Madras 1940
[29] A R S I E, 1928-29, No 239, p 56
[30] S I I, II, iii, No 140
[31] A R S I E, 1961-62, B 460-61
[32] I A, XVIII, p 309, also P B Desai, *ibidem*, p 115
[33] I A XII, p 102
[34] A R S I E, 1951-52, No 33, p 12
[35] E I, XVIII, pp 201 f
[36] A.R. of the Mysore Arch Dept, 1916, pp 48 ff

sangha, and the teacher mentioned is Kumārakīrti Siddhānta of the Yāpanīya sangha and Maḍuvagaṇa. In another inscription there, the donor is Somayya of the Yāpanīya sangha Unlike in most of the other records, here the laity are being directly linked with the Yāpanīya sangha Secondly, the word Yapānīya, the editor observes, is erased Thirdly, a word like Kāḷāmukha-pratibaddha is added later, but it is redundant Obviously some prejudice is shown against Yāpanīyas, but there is no sufficient evidence to show that they had any Kāḷāmukha leanings, because the word Kālāmukha itself is added later It is not unreasonable to presume that one who added the expression Kāḷāmukha-pratibaddha might have tried to erase the term Yāpanīya for removing inconsistency [37] The Lokapur (Dt Belgaum) record of the 12th century A D notes that Brahma (the son of Kallagāvuṇda) erected an image of Purudeva under the advice of Ubhayasiddhānta-cakravarti, the pupil of Sakalendu Siddhāntika of the Kaṇḍuragaṇa of the Yāpanīya sangha [38] At Tengali (Dt Gulburga) there is an inscription of the c 12th century A D on the pedestal of an image It was consecrated by Bammadeva, the pupil of Nāgadeva Siddhāntadeva of the Vadiyura (Vandiyūra?) gana of the Yāpanīya sangha [39] The Manoli (Dt Belgaum) record of the 12th century A D speaks of the erection of Samādhi of Municandradeva of the Yāpanīya sangha He was the Ācarya of the Basadi established by Siriyādevī There is also a reference to the Samādhimarana of Pālyakīrti, the pupil of Municandra of the Yāpanīya sangha [40]

The Adaragunchi (Dt Dharwar) record of the c 13th century A D marks the boundary of the land given to a Basadi (at Ucchangi) of the Yāpanīya sangha and Kāḍurgana? [41] The mutilated record at Hukeri (Dt Belgaum), c 13th century A D mentions the name of Traikīrti of some Gana (the name is gone) of the Yāpanīya sangha [42]

In the underground cell at Kagwad (Dt Belgaum) there is a grand statue of Neminātha There is an inscription on the Nisidi stone which mentions the names of Dharmakīrti and Nāga Bommaras The date given corresponds to A D 1394 There are gaps in the record The teachers of the Yāpanīya sangha and Ponāgavṛksamūlagana are Nemicandra (who is called Tuluvarājya-sthāpanācārya), Dharmakīrti and Nāgacandra [43]

There are some undated records The Sirur (Jamkhandi) record states that the image of Pārśvanātha-bhattāraka was presented by Kāḷisetṭi for the Kusumajinālaya of the Yāpanīya sangha and Vrksamūlagana [44] The Garag (Dt Dharwar) record specifies the Samādhimarana of Śāntivīradeva of the Yāpanīya sangha, Kumudigaṇa There is another worn out record which also mentions the same Sangha and Gaṇa [45] The Rayadrug (Dt Bellary) record refers to the construction of Nisidi Of the eight names mentioned there, we have Candrabhūti of Mūla-sangha and Candrendra, Bādayya and Tammaṇṇa of the Āpanīya sangha [46]

[37] Ed S Shettar J of the Karnatak University, X, 1966, pp 159 ff (in Kannada)

[38] Kannada Research Institute, Dharwar, 1942-48, No 47

[39] A R I E, 1960-61, No 511, also P B Desai, *ibidem*, p 404

[40] A R S I E, 1940-41, Nos 63-65, p 245

[41] A.R S I E, 1941-42, No 3, p 255

[42] A R S I E, 1941-42, No 6, p 261

[43] Jinavijaya (Kannada), Belgaum, July 1931

[44] A R S I E, 1938-39, No 98, p 219

[45] A R S I E, 1925-26, Nos 441-442, p 76

[46] A.R.S.I.E, 1919, No 109, p 12

There are some other inscriptions which have lately come to light. (*i*) One at Sedam of 1124 A D. refers to Prabhācandra Traividya of Maḍuvagaṇa[47] (*ii*) One from Bedali (Dt Belgaum) of 1219 A D refers to the Yāpanīya sangha, Kāreya-gaṇa The teachers mentioned are Mādhava Bhaṭṭāraka, Vinayadeva, kīrti Bhattāraka, Kanakaprabha and Śrīdhara Traividyadeva[48] (*iii*) One from Hannakeri (A D 1209 and 1257) Here is reference to Yapanīya sangha, Mailāpānvaya and Kāreya-gana The teachers mentioned are Kanakaprabha (who is called *jātarūpadhara-vikhyātam*, i e , known for his nudity or *nirgranthatā*) Śrīdhara, Kanakaprabha-pandita[49] (*iv*) On the pītha of the first floor of the temple in the Mangalwar Peth, Kolhapur, there is a record in Kannaḍa which states that Vomiyaṇṇa got prepared the paṭṭa-śālā, he was the brother of Raviyanna, the pupil of Vijayakīrti of the Yapanīya sangha and Punnāgavrksamūlagana[50] (*v*) Lately Dr Gururaj Bhatt sent me a copy of an inscription from the image at Varang (S K) which mentions Kāṇūrgaṇa He is studiyng it more closely

This chronological survey of various inscriptions (from the 5th to the 14th century A D) referring to the Yāpanīya sangha clearly brings out certain broad facts about this Sangha Yāpanīyas, to begin with, were distinguished from Nirgrantha, Śvetapata and Kūrcaka The Yāpanīya Sangha is associated with Ganas like Kumuligana (or Kumudigana), (Koṭi) Maduvagaṇa, Kandur—or Kānur-gana, Punnāga-vrksa-mūla-gana (also linked with Mūla sangha), Vandiyūra gana, Kāreyagana, and Nandi-gaccha and Mailapānvaya This contamination with different Ganas indicates that the Sangha gradually got itself expressed through Ganas, which, as the account of the *Ganabheda* shows, were becoming more prominent in Karnataka and round about The result is that often only the Punnagavrksamūlagana or Kandūrgana is mentioned without specifying the Yāpanīya sangha This should explain how gradually the Yāpanīya Sangha was lost and become mixed with others, especially the Digambaras in the South One of the saints of this sangha is called *jātarūpadhara*, a term generally used by the Digambara monks How the saints of this Sangha compromised their practices and creed are matters for further investigation According to the Nītisāra (7-8) of Indranandi, the Sanghas were there first, Simha-, Nandi-, Sena-, and Deva-sangha, and later grew gaṇa, gaccha etc But in later days, as indicated by the *Ganabheda*, Gana division absorbed and superseded the sanghas This gana-paksapāta is explained in the *śrutāvatāra* (verse 90) which also indicates how different name-endings like -nandi, -vīra, -deva etc came into vogue[51]

From the places where the records are found,[52] it is clear that the teachers of the Yāpanīya Sangha had their sway mostly in the area of the present-day districts of Dharwar, Belgaum, Kolhapur and Gulburga The number of records fond in Andhra and Tamil Nadu is very small That no records of the Yāpanīya sangha are noticed at Śravaṇa Belgol indicates that this seat possibly developed exclusive of the Yāpanīya teachers In Karnataka, it is mainly in the northern part of it that many of the Yāpanīya teachers are associated with the Temple Institution (Generally speaking the preference is for the images of Neminātha and Pārśvanātha) What is striking is that they appear like Trustees

[47] P B Desai *ibidem*, p 403

[48] R S Panchamukhi Karnataka Inscriptions, I, Dharwar 1941, pp 75-76

[49] K G Kundangar Inscriptions from N Karnatak and Kolhapur State, Kolhapur 1939

[50] Jinavijaya (Kannada), Belgaum 1931 (May-June)

[51] See foot-note No 13 above, the Śrutāvatāra is also included in that Volume

[52] See also P B Desai, *ibidem*, pp 164 f

managing the temples and also looking after the maintenance of the Sangha by receiving land-grants from kings and other dignitaries in the society. Such functions are more or less the forerunners of those of the present-day Bhaṭṭarakas in these areas The existence of the institution of nuns (*ārykā*, *kamti* or *kṣāntikā*) in the Jaina order has nothing to do with the doctrinal question whether a woman attains liberation in the same birth This is on par that the doctrine of Ahimsā has never come in the way of the presence of great Dandanāyakas among the Jainas What is needed is correct understanding of the concept of Strīmukti and Ahimsā As it appears, the sangha did not much affect the laity beyond a few individuals and families owing allegiance to some Ācārya or the other

The terms like Sangha, Gaṇa Gaccha and Anvaya have their meanings changed; sangha and gana are often interchanged, and their exhaustive study, in their relations to each other, is a desideratum

It is noted above how Indranandi in his *Nītisāra* calls Yāpanīyas as Jaināhhāsa, and Śrutasāgara has many remarks to make against them, even going to the extent of saying that the statues installed by them, though they are *nagna*, should not be worshipped [53] In spite of all this, the Yāpanīya teachers are highly praised in the records for their learning and practice of ascetic virtues, and the Digambaras in the south are worshipping the statues which are obviously of the Yāpanīya Sangha That shows how the Yāpanīyas became almost one with the Digambaras at least one instance is there that a Yāpanīya monk is described as jātarūpadhara

The Yāpanīyas constituted a Sangha, and its teachers were in charge of temples which had lands to support them It is but natural that these circumstances were quite favourable for cultivating literary activities Haribhadra (*c* 8th century A D) refers to Yāpanīya-tantra in this manner [54]

Strīgrahanam tāsām-api tadbhava eve samsāra-kṣayo bhavati iti jñāpanārtham vacah, yathoktam Yāpanīyatantre no khalu itthī ajīvo, na yāvi abhavva, nā yāvi damsana-virohinī, no amānusā, no anariuppattī, no asamkhejjāuyā, no aīkūramaī, no na uvasamta-mohā, no na suddhācārā, no asuddha-bomdī, no vavasāya-vajjiyā, no apuvvakarana-virohinī, no navagunaṭhānarahiyā, no ajogaladdhīe, no akallāna-bhāyanaṃ ti, kaham na uttamadhamma-sāhiga tti ||

Śrutasāgara tells us that they read Kalpa, to be identified with the *Kalpasūtra*

Śākatāyana, also known as Pālyakīrti, is described by Malayagiri as Yāpanīya[55], and the references from his Sanskrit grammar[56] to Niryukti Bhāṣya etc , clearly indicate that some of the texts of the Ardhamāgadhī canon were acceptable to him He refers to a number of authors, and at least some of them might have belonged to the Yāpanīya Sangha The Apabhramśa poet Svayambhū belonged to Āpulīya or Yāpanīya Sangha, as indicated by some gloss [57] Some scholars hold the view that Vimala also belonged to the Yāpanīya sangha, but this point needs further investigation, by a close study of the *Paumacariya*

[53] His Sanskrit comm on the Ṣaṭprābhṛtādisaṃgraha, Bombay 1920, p 79

[54] See my earlier paper noted above, also Hemacandra's Yogaśāstra, B I ed , p 652

[55] My earlier paper, noted in foot-note 1, above

[56] Śākaṭāyana-Vyākarana (and the Svopajña Amoghavṛtti) with a learned Intro by Dr R Birwe Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha publication, Delhi 1971 See the Intro and also the General Editorial

[57] N Premi Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, 2nd ed , p 197

Śākaṭāyana, the grammarian, mentions himself in his colophon thus[58] iti Śrī-Śruta-kevali-deśīyācāryasya Śākaṭāyanasya krtau Śabdānuśāsane etc This is the way perhaps the Yāpanīya teachers distinguished themselves Even the author of the Tattvārthasūtra, namely Umāsvāti, is described thus

Tattvārthasūtrakartāram Umāsvāti-munīśvaram ।
Srutakevalideśīyam vande ham gunamandiram ॥[59]

That the sūtras and the bhāsya show some clear-cut differences with the Ardha-māgadhī canon and Pūjyapāda is not happy with the text of the sūtras in many places The late Pt Premiji has given same valid reasons why Umāsvāti must have belonged to the Yāpanīya sangha He has further suggested that Śivārya and Aparājitasūri might have belonged to the Yāpanīya Sangha The former is the author of the *Ārādhanā*, quite an ancient text in Prākrit and the latter its commentator in Sanskrit Some of the contexts in their works are not quite consistent either with the Śvetāmbara or Digambara views[60] Likewise Siddhasena-divākara[61], in all probability, was a Yāpanīya, and that is why Haribhadra calls him *Śrutakevali* Siddhasena has his differences with the known doctrines of the Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras With the lapse of the time, the temples once presided over by Yāpanīya teachers as well as the images set up by them are today known as Digambara and are worshipped by Digambaras Naturally the literary works produced by outstanding Yāpanīya teachers are mostly current in the South A closer study of the *Paumacariya* of Vimala, *Padmacarita* of Ravisena, *Varāngacarita* of Jatila (who is heavily indebted to Siddhasena and Umāsvāti), *Paumacariu* of Svayambhū etc , is needed

I may note here a striking point According to the *Ganabheda*, mod Kopbal (Koppaḷa) was a seat of the Yāpanīyas, and it is on the Pallakki Gundu there that we have got the foot-print of Jatācārya or Jatila[62] The Kannada poet Janna, who flourished at the beginning of the 13th century A D , assigns Jatāsimhanandi to Kānūrgana (see *Ananatanātha-purāna* I 17)[63] which is so closely associated with the Yāpanīyas When I edited the first chapter of the Varāngacarita, a controversy was raised whether the author was a Digambara or Śvetāmbara[64]

It is clear from the above details that plenty of references are found to the Yāpanīyas in inscriptions of the South We have to see whether any references are found in Kannada and allied literature Following more or less the story of the *Brhat-Kathākośa* (No 131) of Harisena (931-32 A D),[65] the *Vaddārādhane*[66] in Kannada mentions Jāpuli Sangha The contexts are a bit confused, but both the texts refer to Ardha-phālaka, Kāmbalika, Śvetabhiksu and Yāpanīya Janna (1209 A D) in his Kannada *Anantanāthapurāna* mentions Rāmacandradeva of the Kānūrgana (L 25), and he qualifies Municandra Traividya

[58] Śākaṭāyana-vyākaraṇam, Kolhapur 1907

[59] E C , VIII, Nagar No 46 Though late in age, it is a valuable record of traditional information

[60] N Premi Jaina Sāhitya aura itihāsa, pp 56 ff , 521 f of the 2nd ed

[61] See my Intro to Siddhasena Divākara's Nyāyāvatāra and other works, Jaina Sāhitya Vikāsa Mandala, Bombay 1971

[62] My Intro to the Varāngacarita, Bombay 1938 Above pp 163, 166-7 etc

[63] Ed , Mysore 1972

[64] Annals of the B O R I XIV, i-ii, Poona 1933

[65] Singhi Jaina Series, 17, Bombay 1943

[66] D L Narasimhachar, 4th ed , p 93, Mysore 1970

by the expression Jāvaligeya which is not being correctly explained Possibly the same Municandra with a similar adjective is mentioned in the Kannada *Pārśvanāthapurāna* (L. 33) of Pārśvapandita[67] (A D 1222) In my opinion Jāvaḷigeya stands for his Sangha, Yāpanīya What is more interesting is that Janna assigns Jaṭā-Simhanandi and Indranandi to the Kānūrgana which is associated closely with the Yāpanīya Sangha. Janna's praise of various Ācāryas clearly shows that separatist tendencies of ganas etc , were not observed by these poets

It is seen from inscriptional and literatry evidence that the Yāpanīyas have lived hand-in-hand with Digambaras, and some of their temples and images are worshipped to this day by Digambaras in the South Gunaratna (A D 1343-1418) does not show much acquaintance with the Yāpanīyas, and Śrutasāgara (16th century of the Vikrama era) has hardly any sympathy for them In fact, even today, some scholars of the orthodox school, not knowing that a few images in the so-called Digambara temples are already of the Yāpanīya sect, still object to the old images of the Yāpanīya sect being installed and worshipped Titles like Saiddhāntika, Traividya used by some Yāpanīya Ācāryas indicate their studies of Satkhandāgama etc this point needs further investigation

Gunaratna, while commenting on the *Saddarśana-samuccaya* (beginning of the chapter IV) of Haribhadra, observes thus [68]

Digambarāḥ punr nāgnya-lingāh pāni-pātrāś ca I te caturdhā Kāsthā-samgha-Mūlasamgha-Māthuraasmgha-Gopysamgha-bhedāt I kāṣṭhāsamghe camarībālaiś ca picchikā, Mūlasamghe māyurapicchaih, picchikā, Māthurasamghe mūlato'pi picchikā nādrtā, Gopyā māyūrapicchikā I ādyas trayo'pi samghā vandyamānā dharmavrddhim bhananti, strīnām muktim kevalinām bhuktim sadvratasyāpi sacīvarasya muktim ca na manvate, Gopyās tu vandyamānā dharmalābham bhananti, strīnām muktim kevalināṃ bhuktim ca manyante gopyā yāpanīya ityucyante

Thus Gopya was another name of Yāpanīya He puts it under Digambara, though *strīmukti* and *kevalibhukti* are accepted by them That they accepted these views is borne out by the facts that Śākatāyana, beside his Sanskrit grammar already referred to above, has written two Prakaraṇas, Strīmukti—and Kevali-bhukti-prakarana, and these are already published [69] It is interesting to note that his grammar is more popular with the Digambaras of the South and his two prakaranas are current among the Śvetāmbaras

Later Śrutasāgara (16th century of the Vikrama era) is not quite tolerant to other sects He quotes Indranandi's verse which labels Yāpanīyas as Jainabhāsa, and gives some details about Gopucchika, Śvetavāsa, Drāvida and Yāpanīya About the last two he says[70]

Drāvidāh sāvadyam prāsukam ca na manyante, udbhojanam nirākurvanti I Yāpanīyas tu vesarā ivobhayam manyante, ratnatrayam pūjayanti, kalpam ca vācayanti, strīṇām tadbhave moksam, kevali-jinānām kavalāhāraṃ, paraśāsane sagranthānām moksam ca kathayanti

[67] H Sheshayyangar ed , Madras, 1960, Prof G Venkatsubbiah, Editor, Kannada Nighaṇṭu, Bangalore, drew my attention to this

[68] Bhāratīya Jnānapiṭa ed , Varanasi 1970, pp 160-61

[69] See the Appendix to the Intro by Dr Birwe to the Śākaṭāyanavyākaraṇa, noted above Muni Śrī Jambuvijayaji is bringing out a new ed along with the svopajña commentary

[70] Ṣaṭprābhṛtādisaṃgraha, noted above, p 11

JĪVATATTVĀ-PRADĪPIKĀ ON GOMMATASĀRA*: ITS AUTHOR AND DATE[1]

So far two Sanskrit Commentaries on *Gommatasāra* have come to light the first is *Mandaprabodhikā* (MP) and the second *Jīvatattvapradīpikā* (JP), and both of them have been published in the Calcutta edition[2] of *Gommatasāra* (GS) along with the Hindī commentary *Samyagjñana-chandrikā* (SC) of Todaramalla The Calcutta edition gives MP upto gāthā No 383 of Jīvakānda, though certain Foot-notes of the Editors[3] indicate that they had some more portion with them. Abhayacandra is the author of MP, and it is a matter still to be decided whether Abhayacandra completed his commentary or left it incomplete In this paper I propose to give some details about JP and discuss the problem of its authorship and date

At present JP is the only complete and exhaustive Sanskrit commentary available on GS In fact the credit of making the study of GS sufficiently popular goes to JP All the modern translations of GS[4] in Hindī, English and Marāthī are based on the Hindī SC of Todaramalla, and this in its turn merely elaborates all that is given in JP JP follows MP in many details most of the technical details given by MP are bodily adopted by JP, at times even by mentioning the name of Abhayacandra,[5] the opening Sanskrit verses in JP, at the beginning of each section, are modelled on those found in MP, and in the commentary on gāthā 383 of the Jīvakānda[6] JP plainly says that it would hereafter follow only the Karṇāta-Vrtti because the commentary written by Abhayacandra comes to a stop As I have noted by a cursory reading, JP quotes nearly one hundred verses[7], Prākrt and Sanskrit, besides a couple of Prākrt extracts[8] and a few prose Sūtras etc Many of them can be traced to their sources, but as they stand in the commentary, they are quoted anonymously Some authors[9] like Yativrsabha, Bhūtabali, Samantabhadra, Bhaṭṭākalanka, Nemicandra, Mādhavacandra,[10] Abhayacandra and Keśava Varni are mentioned, and

* Published in the Indian Culture, Calcutta, Vol VII, 1, pp 23-33, Calcutta 1940

1 This essay is prepared during my tenure of the Springer Research Scholarship, University of Bombay

2 Gāndhi-Haribhāi-Devakaraṇa Jaina Granthamālā, 4, Calcutta, this is referred to as Calcutta edition in this paper

3 See pp 615, 898, 1038 etc, of Karmakāṇḍa, Calcutta ed

4 For the various eds of *Gommaṭasāra*, see my paper 'Material on the interpretation of the word Gommaṭa' in IHQ, Vol XVI, Poussin Number

5 See the Commentary on Jivakānda 13, quoted below

6 The numbers of gāthās are given according to the Calcutta edition

7 Calcutta ed, Jīvakānda pp 2, 3, 42, 51, 182, 185, 284, 289, 290, 341, 382, 391, 523, 687, 688, 731, 760, 795, 881, 884, 951, 965, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 1006, 1009, 1017, 1022, 1024, 1033, 1097, 1147, 1155, 1191, 1197, Karmakāṇḍa pp 30, 50, 708, 717, 718, 729, 742, 744, 753, 788 etc

8 Calcutta, ed, Jīvakāṇḍa pp 61, 1080 The Prākṛt quotation on p 1080, I learn from Prof Hiralal, is found in *Dhavalā*

9 Calcutta ed, pp 616, 795, 663, 648, 178, etc, 36, 752, etc, of the Jīvakāṇḍa

10 Mādhavacandra has added some supplementary gāthās to Gommaṭasāra, so he is so often referred to

texts[11] like *Ācārāṅga*, *Tattvārthavivarana*, (*Prameya-kamala-*) *Mārtāṇḍa* are referred to On account of its detailed explanations and elaborate charts and tables JP is a valuable source of information on various points suggested and discussed in *Gommaṭasāra*

JP is not an independent composition in fact the opening verse tells us that is written (taking material) from a Karnāṭa Vrtti about the identification of which we shall see below MP has been fully used, and when MP comes to a stop, JP clearly states that it would follow the Karnāṭa Vrtti thereafter

श्रीमदभयचन्द्रसैद्धान्तचक्रवर्तिविहितव्याख्यानं विश्रान्तमिति कर्णाटवृत्त्यनुरूपमयमनुवदति[12] ।

The authorship of Sanskrit JP has been almost a riddle The following Caupāi of Todaramalla[13] is enough to indicate that he believed that JP was written by Keśava Varni

केशववर्णी भव्यविचार कर्णाटकटीका अनुसार ।
संस्कृतटीका कीनी यहु जो अशुद्ध सो शुद्ध करेहु ।

There are similar remarks elsewhere too in his SC which point to the same thing This view has been accepted and expressed by various scholars who have come to write about GS Pt KHUBACANDRA[14] not only attributes Sanskrit JP to Keśava Varni, but goes also a step further and remarks that the Karnātaka Vrtti mentioned by JP is that of Cāmuṇḍa Rāya to whom reference is made by the name Vīra-mārtaṇḍi in GS Karmakānda, gāthā No 972 Similar views have been expressed by Pt MANOHARLAL,[15] Prof GHOSHAL,[16] Mr J L JAINI,[17] Srīmān GANDHI[18] and others The editors of the Calcutta ed of *Gommatasāra* attribute JP to Keśava Varni on the face-page

Thus Todaramalla and his successors in the field have held the view, without any doubt, that Keśava Varni is the author of the Sanskrit JP Possibly the following verse, as printed in the Calcutta ed ,[19] is the ultimate basis for their view

श्रित्वा कार्णाटिकीं वृत्तिं वर्णिश्रीकेशवै. कृति. ।
कृतेयमन्यथा किंचिद् विशोध्यं तद् बहुश्रुतैः ॥

As this verse stands, only one construction is possible, and we can easily understand the opinion of Todaramalla and his followers But the readings of this verse are not absolutely authentic, because there are some Mss of JP which give a different version altogether

[11] Calcutta ed , pp 760, 660, 649 of the Jivakāṇḍa

[12] Calcutta ed , Jivakāṇḍa p 812

[13] Calcutta ed , Jivakāṇḍa p 1329, in other contexts too he has mentioned this, see p 756 of Jivakāṇḍa and p 2096 of Karmakāṇḍa

[14] *Gommaṭasāra*, Karmakāṇḍa, Rāyacandra-Jain-Śāstramālā (Bombay 1928), Intro p 5

[15] *Gommaṭasāra*, Jivakāṇḍa (Bombay 1961), Introduction

[16] *Dravyasamgraha* (S B J I , Arrah 1917), Intro p 41

[17] *Gommaṭasāra*, Jivakāṇḍa (S B J V Lucknow 1927), Intro p 7

[18] *Gommaṭasāra* with Marāthi Translation, Sholapur 1939, Preface p 1

[19] Jīvakāṇḍa p. 1329.

We get the following verses from a Ms of GS with JP in Śrī Ailaka Pannālāla Digambara Jaina Sarasvatī Bhavana, Bombay [20]

> श्रित्वा कार्णाटिकीं वृत्ति वर्णिश्रीकेशवैः कृताम् ।
> कृतेयमन्यथा किंचित्तद्विशोध्यं बहुश्रुतै. ॥
> श्रीमत्केशवचन्द्रस्य कृतकर्णाटवृत्तितः ।
> कृतेयमन्यथा किंचिच्चेत्तच्छोध्यं बहुभतैः ॥

It is not clear to me why two verses of nearly the same contents are given and what the editor of the Report means by his remark '*pāthāntaram*' which introduces these verses The first verse supplies us with important variants as compared with the verse followed by Todaramalla, and from these verses it is quite plain that the author of JP does not mention his name here, that he wrote his commentary from the Karnāṭaka Vrtti of Keśava Varni, and that he expects the learned to correct his mistakes if there are any

The evidence on the basis of which it was accepted that Keśava Varni is the author of Sanskrit JP is seriously undermined by the alternative readings of the verse No other evidence, internal or external, is brought forth to show that Keśava Varni is the author of Sanskrit JP, and further that this is based on the Karnātaka Vrtti of Cāmunda Rāya is not at all proved It is true that GS tells us that Cāmunda Rāya wrote a Desī (which is understood as a Karnātaka Vrtti) on GS, JP mentions merely a Karnāta Vrtti, and there is no reference at all to Cāmunda Rāya, no Ms of Cāmunnda Rāya 's Vrtti has come to light,[21] and there is no possibility of proving that the Sanskrit JP is following the commentary of Cāmunda Rāya Under these circumstances the alleged evidence to show that Keśava Varṇi is the author of Sanskrit JP is contradicted, and there is no evidence at all to say that this JP is following the Vrtti of Cāmunda Rāya

Now let us see who is the author of Sanskrit JP and what Karnātaka Vrtti he is following I am quoting below the relevent portions from the two Praśastis, one in verse and the other partly in prose and partly in verse, printed at the close of the Calcutta ed of GS (pp 2097-8)

> (1) यत्र रत्नैस्त्रिभिर्लब्ध्वार्हन्त्यं पूज्यं नरामरे ।
> निर्वान्ति मूलसंघोऽयं नन्द्यदाचन्द्रताराकम् ॥ ४ ॥
> तत्र श्रीशारदागच्छे बलात्कारगणोऽन्वयः ।
> कुन्दकुन्दमुनीन्द्रस्य नन्द्याम्नायोऽपि नन्दतु ॥ ५ ॥
> यो गुणैर्गणभृद्गीतो भट्टारकशिरोमणि· ।
> भक्त्या नमामि तं भूयो गुरुं श्रीज्ञानभूषणम् ॥ ६ ॥
> कर्णाटप्रायदेशेशमल्लिभूपालभक्तितः ।
> सिद्धान्तः पाठितो येन मुनिचन्द्रं नमामि तम् ॥ ७ ॥

[20] Report I, Vīra Samvat 2449, pp 104-106

[21] R NARASIMHACARYA *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*, Vol I, pp 46 49

योऽभ्यर्च्य धर्मवृद्ध्यर्थं मह्यं सूरिपदं ददौ ।
भट्टारकशिरोरत्नं प्रभेन्दुः स नमस्यते ॥ ८ ॥
त्रिविद्यविद्याविख्यातविशालकीर्तिसूरिणा ।
सहायोऽस्यां कृतौ चक्रेऽधीता च प्रथमं मुदा ॥ ९ ॥
सूरे. श्रीधर्मचन्द्रस्याभयचन्द्रगणेशिनः ।
वर्णिलालादिभव्यानां कृते कर्णाटवृत्तित ॥ १० ॥
रचिता चित्रकूटे श्रीपार्श्वनाथालयेऽमुना ।
साधुसांगासहेसाभ्यां प्रार्थितेन मुमुक्षुणा ॥ ११ ॥
गोम्मटसारवृत्तिर्हि नन्द्याद् भव्यैः प्रवर्तिता ।
शोधयन्त्वागमात्किंचिद् विरुद्धं चेद् बहुश्रुता ॥ १२ ॥
निर्ग्रन्थाचार्यवर्येण त्रैविद्यचक्रवर्तिना ।
संशोध्याभयचन्द्रेणालेखि प्रथमपुस्तक' ॥ १३ ॥[22]

(11) यमाराध्यैव भव्योघाः प्राप्ता कैवल्यसंपद. ।
शश्वत् पदमापुस्तं मूलसंघमुपाश्रये ॥ १२ ॥
तत्र श्रीशारदागच्छे बलात्कारगणोन्वय ।
कुन्दकुन्दमुनीन्द्रस्य नन्द्यादाचन्द्रतारकम् ॥ ११ ॥

तत्र श्रीमज्जिनधर्माम्बुधिवर्धनपूर्णचन्द्रायमानश्रीज्ञानभूषणभट्टारशिष्येण सौगतसांख्यकणादभिक्ष-क्षपादप्रभाकरादिपरवादिगजगण्डभेरुण्डप्रभाचन्द्रभट्टारकदत्ताचार्यपदेन त्रैविद्यविद्यापरमेश्वरमुनिचन्द्रा-चार्यमुखात् कर्णाटदेशाधिनाथप्राज्यसाम्राज्यलक्ष्मीनिवासमनोत्तममल्लिभूपालप्रयत्नाद् अधीतसिद्धान्तेन वर्णिलालाविहितामहाद् गौर्जरदेशाच्चित्रकूटजिनदाससाहनिर्मापितपार्श्वप्रभुप्रासादाधिष्ठितेनामुना नेमिचन्द्रे-णाल्पमेधसाऽपि भव्यपुण्डरीकोपकृतीहानुरोधेन सकलज्ञातिशिर'शेखरायमाणखण्डेलवालकुलतिलकसाधुवं-शावतंसजिनधर्मोद्धरणधुरीणसाहसागसाहसहसाविहितप्रार्थनाधीनेन विशदत्र विद्यविद्यास्पदविशालकीर्ति-सहायादियं यथाकर्णाटवृत्ति व्यरचि ।

यावच्छ्रीजिनधर्मश्चन्द्रार्कस्यौ च विष्टपं सिद्धाः ।
तावन्नन्दतु भव्यै. प्रपठ्यमाना त्वियं वृत्तिः ॥
निर्ग्रन्थाचार्यवर्येण त्रैविद्यचक्रवर्तिना ।
संशोध्याभयचन्द्रेणालेखि प्रथमपुस्तक. ॥
इत्यभयनन्दिनामाङ्कितायाम् ।

[22] The extract from the Bombay Ms. in the Ailaka P S Bhavana shows some minor variations.

To summarise the bare facts, we learn the following details about the author of JP from both these Praśastis, and they are confirmed by the Ms in the Ailaka Pannālāla Sarasvatī Bhavana The author of Sanskrit JP is Nemicandra[33] of the Mūla Saṅgha, Sāradā Gaccha, Balātkāra Gana, Kundakunda Anvaya and Nandi Āmnāya He was a *śiṣya* of Jñānabhūṣana Bhattāraka He was made a *sūri* or was given Ācārya-pada by Prabhācandra Bhattāraka who was a successful disputant-logician It is through the efforts of the Jaina king Malli Bhūpāla of Karnāṭaka that he studied Siddhānta from Municandra who is styled Traividya-vidyā-parameśvara. Being pressed by Lālā Varni he came from Gaurjara country and stayed at Citrakūṭa in the temple of Pārśvanātha built by Jinadāsa Sāha For the benefit of Dharmacandra, Abhayacandra and other pious people, and being requested by Sāha Sanga and Sāha Sahesa[34] of the Khandelavāla family, he wrote his commentary, namely Sanskrit JP, following the Karnātaka Vrtti through the help of Traividya-vidya Viśālakīrti We are told that the first copy was prepared by Abhayacandra who is called Nirgranthācārya and Traividya-cakravartin

The metrical *praśasti* agrees with the prose *praśasti* in all the fundamental details, but it does not mention the author's name, viz , Nemicandra, which is clearly given by the prose *praśasti* There being complete agreement in the details given and there being no conspicuous contradiction, one has to admit that Nemicandra is the author of JP according to the Praśastis

Secondly, the colophons of JP at the close of the various sections of GS run thus

इत्याचार्यश्रीनेमिचन्द्रविरचितायां गोम्मटसारापरनामपञ्चसंग्रहवृत्तौ
जीवतत्त्वप्रदीपिकायां etc

Naturally *-viracitāyām* is an adjective of *Jīvatattvapradīpikāyām*, and so we will have to attribute the authorship of JP to Ācārya Nemicandra

Thirdly, the phrase *ācārya-śrī-Nemicandra-viracitāyam* cannot go with *Gommatasāra* This Ācārya Nemicandra is to be distinguished from Nemicandra Siddhānta-Cakravartin, the author of GS In many places JP refers to the author of GS, and almost necessarily he is mentioned with his glorious title Siddhānta-Cakravartin[35]

Fourthly, the editor of the Ailaka Pannālāla S B Report plainly attributes JP to Nemicandra possibly from its colophons

Fifthly, controverting the opinion that Jñānabhūsana is the author of Gommaṭasāra-ṭīkā Pt NATHURAM PREMI[36] has shown that Nemicandra is the author, and from the details given by him there it is clear that he has in view JP and its author

Lastly, the absence of the mention of Nemicandra in the metrical prasasti does not prove anything positive, nor can it support, by any stretch of imagination, the alleged authorship of JP by Keśava Varni We know some details about Keśava Varni, and they do not agree with those given in these Praśastis.

[33] The metrical Praśasti is written in the first person, so this name is not mentioned

[34] The two Praśastis show some variant readings of these names

[35] See for instance p 648 Jivakāṇḍa, p 600 Karmakāṇḍa of the Calcutta ed

[36] *Siddhāntasārādi-samgraha*, Māṇikcandra D J Granthamālā 21, Bombay 1922, Intro p 12, footnote.

Thus there is no evidence at all to say that Keśava Varṇī is the author of JP, but on the other hand the above points definitely show that Nemicandra is the author of JP, and he is not to be confounded with the author of *Gommatasāra*[27]

As to the Karnātaka Vrtti followed by JP, the two verses quoted above definitely say that Keśava-varṇī's Vṛtti is being followed Mss of this Vrtti are available today. I have examined a Ms of this Vrtti on Jīvakānda belonging to Lakṣmīsena Matha, Kolhapur [28] The name of this Kannaḍa Vrtti also is *Jīvatattva-pradīpikā*, and it is somewhat bigger than Sanskrit JP It opens with many Kannaḍa verses composed by the author himself Just as *Dhavalā* is composed partly in Prākrit and partly in Sanskrit, this Vrtti is partly in Kannada and partly in Sanskrit (what is known as *manipravāḷa* style), especially at the beginning of it Many Prākrit quotations are found here and there. The gāthās of GS are supplied with Sanskrit Chāyā, and the various etymological discussions are in Sanskrit

Keśava Varṇī was a pupil of Abhayasūri Siddhānta-Cakravartin, and he wrote his Vrtti at the order of Dharmabhūsana Bhaṭṭāraka in the Śaka year 1281 or A D 1359 [29]

I have compared Keśava-varṇī's Vrtti with MP of Abhayacandra, and I feel convinced that Keśava Varṇī has fully availed himself of the work of Abhayacandra. I have been able to spot out at least one specific reference to Abhayacandra in the Kannada Vrtti of Keśava Varṇī.[30]

Comparing the Sanskrit JP of Nemicandra with the Kannada JP of Keśava Varṇī, I find that the former is entirely based on the latter. Nemicandra has left out portions here and there, the Sanskrit portions are retained as they are, and whatever is in Kannada is literally rendered into Sanskrit In the case of gāthās on which MP is not available there is nothing in Nemicandra's JP which is not found in the Kannada JP of Keśava Varṇī, and possibly it is for this reason that Nemicandra plainly says *yathā-karnāta-vṛtti vyaraci* or *karnāta-vrttitah*

I may quote here one crucial extract (Jīvakānda gāthā No 13) from the three commentaries which would show their mutual relation, *Mandaprabodhikā*[31]

देशविरते प्रमत्तविरते इतरस्मिन्नप्रमत्तविरते च क्षायोपशमिकचारित्रलक्षण एव भावो वर्तते। देशविरते प्रत्याख्यानावरणकषायाणां सर्वघातिस्पर्धकोदयाभावलक्षणे क्षये, तेषामेव हीनानुभागरूपतया परिणतानां सदवस्थालक्षणे उपशमे च, देशघातिस्पर्धकोदयसहिते उत्पन्नं देशसंयमरूपचारित्रं क्षायोपशमिकम्। प्रमत्तविरते तीव्रानुभागसंज्वलनकषायाणां प्रागुक्तलक्षणक्षयोपशमसमुत्पन्नसंयमरूपं प्रमादमलिनं सकलचारित्रं क्षायोपशमिकम्। अत्र संज्वलनानुभागाना प्रमादजनकत्वमेव तीव्रत्वम्। अप्रमत्तविरते मन्दानुभागसंज्वलनकषायाणां प्रागुक्तक्षयोपशमोत्पन्नसंयमरूपं निर्मलं सकलचारित्रं क्षायोपशमिकम्।

[27] For the interpretation of this title see my paper 'Gommaṭa', *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, Bombay, Vol II. Cf *Infra* article No 8, pp 217-26

[28] It is a paper Ms measuring 12 5 × 8 5 inches, and it contains 387, leaves The date of the Ms is given as Śaka 1206 which is apparently a scribes error, when we remember that Keśava Varṇī wrote his Vṛtti in Śaka 1281.

[29] *Karnāṭaka Kavicarite* (Bangalore 1924), pp. 415-16.

[30] See the extract given below

[31] Calcutta ed , p 36

तु शब्दः असंयतादिव्यवच्छेदार्थः । स खलु देशविरतादिषु प्रोक्तक्षायोपशमिको भाव· चारित्रमोहं प्रतीत्य भणित· तथा उपरि उपशमकादिषु चारित्रमोहं प्रतीत्य भणिष्यते ॥

Kannaḍa JP of Keśava Varṇı [33]

देशविरतनोलं[33] प्रमत्तसयतनोलं इतरनप्प अप्रमत्तसंयतनोलं क्षायोपशमिक संयममक्कुं देशसंयतापेक्षेयिंदं प्रत्याख्यानकषायंगलुदयिसल्पट्ट देशघातिस्पर्धकानन्तैकभागानुभागोदयदोडने उदयमनेयददे क्षीयमाणंगळप्पविवक्षितनिषेकंगल सर्वघातिस्पर्धकंगळनंत बहुभागंगलुदयाभावल (क्षण) क्षयदोळमवरुपरितननिषेकंगळप्पनुदय प्राप्तंगळगे सदवस्थालक्षणमप्पुपशमसुंटागुत्तिरलु समुद्भूतमप्पुदरिंदं चारित्रमोहमं कुरितु देशसंयममदु क्षायोपशमिकभावमेंदु पेळल्पट्टुदु । अंते प्रमत्ताप्रमत्तर्गे संज्वलनकषायंगळ उदितदेशघातिस्पर्धकानंतैकभागानुभागदोडने उदयमनेय्ददे क्षीयमाणंगळप्पविवक्षितोदय निषेकंगळ सर्वघातिस्पर्धकानन्तबहुभागगलुदयाभावलक्षणक्षयदोळमवरुपरितननिषेकंगलप्पनुदयप्राप्तंगल्गे सदवस्थालक्षणमप्प उपशमसुंटागुत्तिरलु समुत्पन्नमप्पुदरिंदं चारित्रमोहमं कुरितिल्लियुं सकलसंयममुं क्षायोपशमिकभावमेंदु पेळल्पट्टुवुदेंबुदु श्रीयभयसूरिसिद्धान्तचक्रवर्तिगळभिप्रायं । मेलंगेयु अपूर्वकरणादिगुणस्थानगळोळं चारित्रमोहनीयमने कुरितु तत्तद्गुणस्थानंगळोळु भावंगळरेयल्पडुवुवु ॥

Sanskrit JP of Nemıcandra [34]

देशविरते प्रमत्तसयते तु पुन· इतरस्मिन् अप्रमत्तसंयते च क्षायोपशमिकसयमलक्षणो भावो भवति । देशसंयतापेक्षया प्रत्याख्यानावरणकषायाणां उदयागतदेशघातिस्पर्धकानन्तबहुभागानुभागोदयेन सहानुदयागतक्षीयमाणविवक्षितोदयनिषेकसर्वघातिस्पर्धकानन्तबहुभागानामुदयाभावलक्षणक्षये तेषामुपरितननिषेकाणां अनुदयप्राप्ताना सदवस्थालक्षणोपशमे च सति समुद्भूतत्वात् चारित्रमोहं प्रतीत्य देशसयमः क्षायोपशमिकभाव इत्युक्तम् । तथा प्रमत्ताप्रमत्तयोरपि सज्वलनकषायाणामुदयागतदेशघातिस्पर्धकानन्तैकभागानुभागेन सह अनुदयागतक्षीयमाणविवक्षितोदयनिषेकसर्वघातिस्पर्धकानन्तबहुभागानां उदयाभावलक्षणक्षये तेषां उपरितननिषेकाणां अनुदयप्राप्ताना सदवस्थालक्षणोपशमे च सति समुत्पन्नत्वात् चारित्रमोहं प्रतीत्यात्रापि सकलसयमोऽपि क्षायोपशमिको भाव इति भणितं इति श्रीमदभयचन्द्रसूरिसिद्धान्तचक्रवर्त्यभिप्रायः । तथा उपर्यपि अपूर्वकरणादिगुणस्थानेषु चारित्रमोहनीयं प्रतीत्य तत्तद्गुणस्थानेषु भावा ज्ञातव्याः ॥

It ıs clear from these extracts how closely Nemıcandra follows Keśava Varṇı, how the Kannaḍa style of Keśava Varṇı ıs full of Sanskrıt words and could be easily rendered ınto Sanskrıt, and how both Keśava and Nemıcandra refer to Abhayacandra

As to the dates of these commentarıes, MP ıs earlıer than A D 1359 when Keśava Varṇı finished his Vṛttı In his MP Abhayacandra refers to one Bālacandra Panḍıtadeva[35]

[33] Kolhapur Ms p 16

[33] This commentary ıs wrıtten ın what ıs called Old-Kannaḍa, even those who do not know Kannaḍa can easily compare this with Sk JP, and ıt ıs for this purpose that I have transcrıbed ıt ın Devanāgarı characters Much of ıt ıs Sanskrıt written with Kannaḍa termınatıons This ıs bound to happen, because the author ıs forced to use varıous technical terms which are all Sanskrıtic

[34] Calcutta ed , p 36

[35] Calcutta ed., Jīvakāṇḍa, p. 150.

whom I am inclined to identify with Bālendu Paṇḍita mentioned in a Śravana Beḷgoḷa Inscription[36] of A.D 1313, and if it is accepted we are able to push back that date some fifty years earlier Further I find from their titles and some minor details given therein that our Abhayacandra and Bālacandra are identical, in all probability, with those glorified in Belur Inscriptions[37] which inform us that Abhayacandra passed away in A D 1279 and Bālacandra in A D 1274 So we can tentatively assign MP of Abhayacandra to the third quarter of the 13th century A D.

Nemicandra has not mentioned the year when he finished his JP As he closely follows Keśava Varni's Vrtti, his JP is later than A D 1359, and further it is earlier than Samvat 1818, or A.D 1761, because in this year Todaramalla finished his Hindī rendering of Sanskrit JP[38] This period is still a wide range, and let us see whether these two limits can be brought nearer Nemicandra has mentioned the names of many of his contemporaries like Jñānabhūṣaṇa, Municandra, Prabhācandra, Viśālakīrti etc, but these names are so often repeated in the case of Jaina teachers and monks that any identification based on the mere similarity of name has no value at all, and if there is no other evidence, such identifications should not be attempted even His reference to Malli Bhūpāla is of special significance He is mentioned as a king of Karnātaka and a Jainottama[39] Between A D 1359 and 1761 we are not aware of any outstanding Jaina king of Karnāṭaka, and so we will have to understand that Malli Bhūpāla was perhaps a ruler of some minor state in Karnātaka Turning to Jaina literary references, I find that one Malli, a ruler, is often associated with some Jaina authors According to Śubhacandra Gurvāvalī, Vijayakīrti (beginning of the 16th century A D) was respected by king Malli[40] Being a contemporary of Vijayakīrti he might be put at the beginning of the 16th century We are not given any details about his place and faith Secondly, Vidyānandasvāmī,[41] the pupil of Viśālakīrti, is said to have been worshipped by Malli Rāya, and this Vidyānanda[42] passed away in A D 1541 This also indicates that there was one Malli king at the beginning of the 16th century The Humch inscription makes the point further clear that this king associated with Vidyānanda is called Sāḷuva Malli Rāya[43] This brings us on a historical ground from merely traditional legends Sāḷuva kings ruled over a portion of Kanara district and they professed Jainism[44] Malli Bhūpāla is a Sanskritised form of Malli Rāya, and I feel no doubt that Nemicandra is referring to Sāḷuva Malli Rāya, though he has not mentioned the family Being mentioned in a record of 1530 A D, we may put Sāluva Malli Rāya in the first quarter of the 16th century, and this agrees well with his being associated with

[36] *Epigraphia Carnatica* II (Ed RN), No 65

[37] *E C* V (Ed BLR), Nos 131-133

[38] *Jaina Hitaishi*, Vol 13, p 22

[39] See the Praśastis above

[40] *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara* I, 4, p 54, also *Annals* of the Bhandarkar O R I, XIII, i, p 41

[41] *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara* V, 4, pp 125, 128, etc, of Praśastisamgraha

[42] DR B A SALETORE has thrown a good deal of light on the personality and activities of Vidyānanda, see *Mediaeval Jainism* (Bombay 1938), pp 371 etc, 'Delhi Sultans as Patrons of Jaina Gurus of Karṇātaka' in the *Karnataka Historical Quarterly*, IV, 1-2, pp 77-86, 'Vādi Vidyānanda' in *The Jaina Antiquary*, IV, i, pp 1-20

[43] *E C* VIII, Nagar No 46

[44] *E C* VIII, Intro pp 13-14, *Mysore and Coorg* from the Inscriptions (London 1909) pp 152-53, *Mediaval Jainism* pp 318 etc

Vijayakīrti and Vidyānanda Thus Nemicandra being a contemporary of Sāḷuva Malli Rāya, we can assign the composition of Sanskrit JP to the beginning of the 16th century A.D.

Pt PREMI[45] has referred to another *praśasti* of Nemicandra's JP which was published in *Jaina Mitra*, 26th August, 1915. The details given by him are covered by my summary of the two Praśastis given above He does not refer to Malli Bhūpāla As he has not given any extracts, we do not know whether this item is omitted by him or was not at all included in that *praśasti* One important fact noted by Pt PREMI from that *praśasti* is that the Sanskrit JP was finished in 2177 Vīra-nirvāna Samvat, which, according to the present calculation, stands for A.D 1650 This date cannot make Malli Bhūpāla and Nemicandra contemporaries As the acutal *praśasti* is not quoted, it is difficult to judge the merits of this reference. In all probability, A.D 1650 is the date of the completion of a later Ms of JP and not of the completion of JP itself

To conclude, Keśava Varni is not the author of Sanskrit JP, there is no evidence to say that the Sanskrit JP is based on the Karnātaka Vrtti of Cāmunda Rāya on GS, Nemicandra, who is to be distinguished from the author of GS, is the author of the Sanskrit JP, and his JP is heavily indebted to the Kannada JP written by Keśava Varni in A D 1359, and being a contemporary of Sāḷuva Malli Rāya, Nemicandra (and his JP) should be assigned to the beginning of the 16th century A D

[45] *Siddhāntasārādi-saṁgraha*, Bombay 1922, Indtro p 12

MATERIALS FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF THE TERM 'GOMMAṬA'*

Signification of the term Gommata, which occurs in the popular name Gommaṭeśvara given to the colossal images at Śaravana Beḷgoḷa, Kārkaḷ and Veṇūr and in the title of the Prākrt text *Gommaṭasāra*, has been subjected to a good deal of discussion [1] The issue, I believe, can be decided by a clear and correct understanding of a few gāthās of *Gommaṭasāra* containing a few words which have been often misunderstood I propose to give here their translations with a few critical and historical notes [2]

Jīvakānda, Gāthā No. 733 [3]

अज्जज्जसेण गुणगणसमूहसंधारि अजियसेणगुरू ।
भुवणगुरू जस्सगुरू सो राओ गोम्मटो जयउ ॥

'Victory to Gommata Rāya whose teacher is the preceptor Ajitasena, the tutor of the world, that upholds the range of virtues and the religious order of the respectable preceptor Āryasena '

Notes Repetition of both *gana* and *samūha* tempts me to follow SC which sees a reference there to the Gana, the ascetic order of Jaina monks Possibly the author implies that Ajitasena not only possessed the virtues of Āryasena but was also a support of the Sena-gana Cāmunda Rāya is often mentioned simply as Rāya (Skt. Rājan) which was a title bestowed on him by Rājamalla in recognition of his munificence [4] Gommaṭa is a personal name and Rāya, a title of Cāmunda Rāya We get the following facts here Āryasena was a meritorious teacher of old, possibly of the Sena-gana, Ajitasena possessed virtues like him and was a support of the Senagana, Ajitasena was held in great respect, as he is called *bhuvanaguruh*, and Gommata Rāya *alias* Cāmunda Rāya was a *śiṣya* of Ajitasena

* Published in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol XVI, pp 819-26, Calcutta 1940

[1] *Indian Historical Quarterly*, IV, pp 270 ff

[2] The following editions and translations are utilised in this paper

(*i*) *Gommaṭasāra*, Jivakāṇḍa, with the Hindī translation of Khūbachanda, Rāyachandra Jaina Śāstramālā (RJS), Bombay 1916

(*ii*) *Gommaṭasāra*, Karmakāṇḍa, with the Hindī translation of Manoharalāla, RJS, Bombay 1928

(*iii*) *Gommaṭasāra*, with two Sanskrit commentaries, *Jīvatattvapradīpikā* (JP) and *Mandaprabodhikā*, and a Hindī commentary *Samyagjñānacandrikā* (SC) of Toḍaramalla, Gāndhī-Haribhāi-Devakaraṇa-Jaina-Granthamālā, No 4, Calcutta,

(*iv*) *Gommaṭasāra*, Jīvakāṇḍa, with the English translation of J L Jaini, Sacred Books of the Jains (SBJ), Vol V, Lucknow 1927.

(*v*) *Gommaṭasāra*, Karmakāṇḍa, Parts I-II, with the English translation of J L Jaini and Sītal Prasādaji, SBJ, Vols VI and X, Lucknow 1927 and 1937

[3] Some of these ends. differ in the numbering of the Gāthās I.H Q, December 1940.

[4] *Epigraphia Carnatica*, II (Ed RN), Intro pp 14-15.

Karmakāṇḍa, Gāthā No 965

गोम्मटसंगहसुत्तं गोम्मटदेवेण गोम्मटं रइयं ।
कम्माण णिज्जरट्ठं तच्चट्ठवधारणट्ठं च ।

'This text (=*sūtra*) Gommaṭa-samgraha by name is composed in an attractive manner (=*gommaṭam*) by Vardhamāna Mahāvīra (=*Gommata-devena*) for the shedding of the Karmas and for the ascertainment of the significance of reality or principles'

Notes The word *sūtra* implies the sanctity and authority of the work *Gommata-samgraha* is the name of the text, and it is popularly called *Gommatasāra*, *sāra* and *samgraha* being synonyms *JP* gives the name of the work as *Gommata-sāra-samgraha-sūtram* It is the belief of all Jaina authors that the contents of the scriptures, so far as the present ones concerned, belong to Vardhamāna or Mahāvīra, the 24th Tīrthankara of the Jainas So *JP* translates '*Gommata-devena Śrī Vardhamāna-devena*' Gommata is the name of Cāmunda Rāya who is a pious devotee of Tīrthankaras in general and Mahāvīra in particular So Mahāvīra (or any other Tīrthankara, see No 968 below) could be called '*Gommatasya devaḥ*' Further the author is expressing his modesty by attributing the work to Tīrthankaras *Gommaṭam* may be taken as an adjective of *-suttam*, or understood adverbially following JP which says, '*gommatam=naya-pramāna-viṣayam*', 'conforming to Nayas and Pramānas', or in other words 'in an authoritative and attractive manner' Taking it as an adjective, it means 'this attractive scripture *Gommata-samgraha*' In Marāthī the word *Gommata* means 'fair', 'charming', 'attractive' etc The repetition of the word Gommata with varying shades of meaning appears to me only a way of glorifying Gommata *alias* Cāmunda Rāya Jinasena also has done like this with respect to Vīrasena which name also is given to Mahāvīra[6] The verse runs thus

भूयादावीरसेनस्य वीरसेनस्य शासनम् ।
शासनं वीरसेनस्य वीरसेनकुशेशयम् ॥

and its clear interpretation is still a desideratum

Karmakānda, Gāthā No 966

जम्हि गुणा विस्संता गणहरदेवादिइड्ढिपत्ताणं ।
सो अजियसेणणाहो जस्स गुरू जयउ सो राओ ॥

'Victory to that Rāya (i e , Cāmuṇḍa Rāya) whose preceptor is Ajitasenanātha that possesses (literally, in whom are resting) the virtues of Ganadharadevas and others endowed with supernormal powers'

Notes Ajitasena is ranked with Ganadharas, the direct disciples of a Tīrthankara, *rddhi* refers to some miraculous or supernatural powers acquired by the practice of penances which are of eight kinds Buddhi, Kriyā, Vikriyā, Tapas, Bala, Auṣadhi, Rasa and Ksetra In short it means that the saint Ajitasena possessed great merits through penances

[6] *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, Vol I, edited by Prof Hiralal, Amraoti 1939, Intro p 37, verse No 17 quoted from *Jayadhavalā*

Karmakāṇḍa, Gāthā No. 967

सिद्धंतुदयतडुग्गयणिम्मलवरणेमिचंदकरकलिया ।
गुणरयणभूसणंबुहिमइवेला भरउ भुवणयलं ॥

'May the tide in the form of wisdom of the ocean in the form of Guṇarathnabhūṣana (*alias* Cāmunda Rāya, also the ocean containing meritorious gems) urged on by the rays of brilliant and full (=*vara*) moon in the form of Nemicandra rising on the eastern mountain in the form of Siddhānta (i e , the Jaina scripture), flood the surface of the earth'.

Notes Just as the tide of the ocean, which possesses many jewels, incited by the full moon rising on the eastern mount, floods the earth, so also the author wishes that the wisdom of Cāmunda Rāya, who has got the title *guna-ratna-bhūṣana*,[6] might spread or be well-known all over the earth being nourished by Nemicandra possessed of the scriptural knowledge The verse is full of *śleṣa* and hence somewhat difficult, but the meaning is quite clear Nemicandra according to the Hindī Translation, might refer to the image of Neminātha erected by Cāmunda Rāya (see Gāthā 968 below) I think, it stands for the author himself who extracted *Gommatasāra* from the Siddhānta, namely, *Dhavalā* etc Gunaratna-bhūsana is a title of Cāmunda Rāya and it is mentioned elsewhere too.

Karmakānda, Gāthā No 968

गोम्मटसंगहसुत्तं गोम्मटसिहरुवरि गोम्मटजिणो य ।
गोम्मटरायविणिम्मिय दक्खिणकुक्कडजिणो जयउ ॥

'Victory to the scripture Gommata-samgraha (i.e , *Gommaṭasāra*) to the Gommaṭa-Jina (i e the image of Jaina Tīrthankara Neminātha in the temple built by Cāmuṇḍa Rāya) on the beautiful mountain and to the image of Kukkaṭa-Jina[7] of the South installed by Gommata Rāya (i e , Cāmunda Rāya)

Notes This is an important verse and deserves a cautious interpretation First, the author wishes victory to this text *Gommaṭasāra* Secondly, he glorifies Gommata-jina on the Gommata mount Earlier scholars[8] have understood that this refers to the image of Gommateśvara on the Vindhyagiri at Śravana Belgola, but their interpretation is wrong for the following reasons According to the Skt Commentary JP , Gommaṭa-jina stands for the image of the Tīrthankara Neminātha, one cubit in height and made of Indra-nīla stone, erected in the temple built by Cāmunda Rāya, and moreover the statue of Bāhubali is being separately mentioned in the second line We have seen above how our author uses Gommata-deva, or Jina in the sense of Tīrthankara There is absolutely no improbability in the interpretation given by JP So Gommata-Jina means the Jina (-image) of Gommaṭa, that is, installed by Gommata Cāmundarāya in the temple built by him This temple is to be identified with the famous Cāmundarāya Basti (see Gāthā 970 below) on

[6] See the concluding verses of *Cāmuṇḍarāya-purāna* (ed , Bangalore 1928, p iii of the Intro); *Karnātaka Kavicarita*, Vol I, p 46 of the revised ed , Bangalore 1924

[7] Kukkuṭa is the usual form met with elsewhere

[8] M Govind Pai *IHQ* , Vol IV, p 28, also A Shantirāj Shāstri in his *Kannaḍa Śrī Gomma-ṭeśvara Carita*, Mysore, 1940, p 22

the Candragırı at Śravaṇa Beḷgola.[9] There appears to be some foundatıon of facts for the interpretatıon of JP that ıt was the ımage of Nemınātha made of Indra-nīla precıous stone and one cubıt ın heıght Orıgınally Cāmuṇḍarāya Bastı contaıned the ımage of Nemınātha ıs clear from the figures of Yakṣa and Yakṣī of Nemınātha at the sıdes of the Garbhagṛha doorway ın the Sukhanāsı To-day the temple contaıns the ımage of Nemınātha, about five feet hıgh, thıs ıs not to be ıdentıfied wıth the ımage ınstalled there orıgınally by Cāmuṇḍa Rāya, but ıt appears that thıs ımage was got prepared by Ecana, for a temple buılt by hım some tıme before A D 1138 The fact that ıt ıs the ımage of Nemınātha tempts me to surmıse that the orıgınal ımage of Indra-nīla stone not beıng there, some body has put thıs ımage there from another temple founded by Ecana [10] What happened to the orıgınal ımage we cannot say ın the absence of any evıdence In the lıght of the ınterpretatıon of Gommaṭa Jına, Gommaṭa-śıkhara lıterally means 'an attractıve mountaın', and thıs meanıng ıs not ınconsıstent wıth that of Candragırı That mount beıng smaller of the two could be called 'lovely, attractıve' Thus the second ıtem glorıfied ıs the ımage of Nemınātha ınstalled by Cāmunda Rāya ın hıs temple on Candra-gırı Thırdly the author wıshes vıctory to Kukkata Jına of the South ı e , the colossal statue of Bāhubalı at Śravana Beḷgoḷa ınstalled by Cāmunda Rāya on the mountaın Vındhyagırı The word 'South' dıstınguıshes the ımage at Beḷgola from the mythologıcal ımage of Bāhubalı, 525 bow-lengths ın heıght, erected by Bharata at Paudanapura [11]

Karmakānda, Gāthā No 969

जेण विणिम्मियपडिमावयणं सव्वट्ठसिद्धिदेवेहिं ।
सव्वपरमोहिजोगिहिं दिट्ठं सो गोम्मटो जयउ ॥

'Vıctory to Gommaṭa (ı e , Cāmunda Rāya) who has ınstalled the statue, the face of whıch ıs seen (wıth reverence) by the gods of Sarvārtha-sıddhı (ı e , the hıghest heaven) and by the saınts that are endowed wıth full and claırvoyant knowledge

Notes Thıs gāthā only contınues the reference to the ımage of Bāhubalı made ın the second lıne of the above verse The author partıcularly refers to the face of the colossal ımage of Bāhubalı, and those who have personally seen the ımage wıll apprecıate ıt The serene face of Bāhubalı's statue ıs so charmıng and ımpressıve that even great gods and gıfted saınts came to see ıt

Karmakānda, Gāthā No 970

वजयणं जिणभवणं ईसिपभारं सुवण्णकलसं तु ।
तिहुवणपडिमाणिक्कं जेण कयं जयउ सो राओ ॥

'Vıctory to that (Cāmuṇḍa) Rāya who constructed a Jaına temple, Īṣatprāgbhāra by name, whose foundatıon ıs of adamantıne, whıch has a golden dome and whıch ıs a unıque standard beyond comparıson ın all the three worlds

[9] *EC*, II (ed RN), Intro p 6
[10] See R Narasımhacharya's remarks ın *EC*, II, Intro. p 6
[11] ıbıdem, Intro pp. 12-15

Notes *Iṣat-prāgbhāra* is the name of the domain of liberation[12], the abode of liberated souls at the top of the Universe according to Jainism It is really a happy name that can be given by a pious devotee to a temple I am inclined to believe that our author is referring to the Cāmuṇḍarāya Basti on the Candragiri[13] especially because it has a conspicuous and prominent dome or Kalaśa. We cannot expect the golden dome to be there to this day, but the dome on which gold-plating might have been put still characterises the Cāmuṇḍarāya Basti The base of the temple is quite massive, and it stands there at least for the last one thousand years So our author's reference to its adamantine base is more than justified Perhaps we are to read *vajjayalam* Its real name Īṣat-prāgbhāra appears to have been superseded by the popular name Cāmuṇḍarāya Basti

Karmakāṇḍa, Gāthā No 971

जेणुब्भियथंभुवरिमजक्खतिरीटग्गकिरणजलधोया ।
सिद्धाण सुद्धपाया सो राओ गोम्मटो जयउ ॥

'Victory to that Gommata Rāya (i e , Cāmunda Rāya) who has washed the holy (literally, pure) feet of Siddhas (i e , the liberated souls) by the water in the form of the fresh rays of the crown of the image of Yaksa on the pillar erected by him '

Notes This verse states that Cāmuṇḍa Rāya had erected a pillar dedicated to a Yaksa whose crown was studded with jewels I would suggest that this verse probably refers to Tyāgada Brahmadeva Pillar[14] at Śravana Belgola which, according to tradition, was erected by Cāmunda Rāya, and this tradition is confirmed by an important inscription thereon partly effaced now Some commentators have implied that the verse refers to a very tall pillar, but the Tyāgada Brahmadeva Pillar is not so tall

Karmakānda, Gāthā No 972

गोम्मटसुत्तल्लिहणे गोम्मटरायेण जा कया देसी ।
सो राओ चिरकाले नामेण य वीरमत्तंडी ॥

'Eternal (victory) to that (Cāmunda) Rāya by whom (viz , Gommatarāya) was composed a Deśī (i e a Kannada Vrtti or commentary) Vīra-mārtandī by name, while the Gommatasūtra (i e *Gommatasāra*) was being written

Notes The syntax of this gāthā is not quite satisfactory JP perhaps reads *Vīra-mattamdo*, as it takes that phrase as an adjective of *rāo* JP renders *jā kayā deśī* by *yā deśi bhāṣā kṛtā* and Pt Todaramalla and others take this as a reference to Cāmunda Rāya's Kannada commentary on *Gommaṭasāra* R Narasimhacharya has not attributed any such work to Cāmunda Rāya[15] it only means that no Ms of this work has come to light as yet The opening verse of JP plainly says that it is based on a Karnāṭa-vrtti We have no evidence to say that this is a reference to Cāmunda Rāya's work In Kannaḍa we know

[12] Trilokasāra (Bombay 1918), p 231, verse No 556

[13] *E C*, II (ed RN), Intro p 6

[14] ibidem, Intro p 24

[15] *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarita*, Vol I, pp. 46-50

a commentary on *Gommaṭasāra*, *Jīvatattva pradīpikā* by name,[16] composed by Keśava-varṇi who finished it in A D. 1359 He was a pupil of Abhayasūri-siddhānta-cakravarti and wrote the commentary in obedience to the instruction of Dharmabhūṣana. The reading Vīramārtanḍī, as it stands, would qualify Deśī; and it would be the name of that Vṛtti. Cāmuṇḍa Rāya had a title Vīra-mārtanḍa, which he got by displaying his valour on the battle-field of Gonūr in the Noḷamba war, and it is not unlikely that he called his commentary after one of his titles If our interpretation of the word Deśī is correct, it means that Kannaḍa, a Dravidian language, is being alled Deśī by an author writing in Prākrit [17]

[16] The Sanskrit commentary, *Jīva-tattva pradīpikā*, on *Gommaṭasār* is attributed by many scholars to Keśava-varṇi, but for this there is no evidence at all My understanding of the available facts leads me to the conclusion that the author of the Skt *Jīvatattva-pradīpikā* is one Nemicandrācārya, his commentary is based on Keśava-Varṇi's Kannaḍa commentary of the same name, and this Nemicandra's commentary is perhaps later than *Mandaprabodhikā* I have just stated my conclusion here, and the topic may be taken up later for an exhaustive study

[17] This paper is written during my tenure of the Springer Research Scholarship, University of Bombay

GŎMMAṬA[1*]

THE word *Gommata* occurs in two important contexts The three colossal images of Bāhubali at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, Kārkala and Venūr are popularly known by the name Gŏmmateśvara or Gomateśvara[2], and the Jaina text, *Pañcasaṃgraha*, composed or compiled by Nemicandra Siddhānta Cakravartin, is usually called by the name *Gommatasāra*[3]. It is a significant fact that the word occurs in the secondary names in both the cases The personality represented by these three images is known by the names Bābhubali, Bhujabali, Dorbali, Kukkuṭeśvara etc , and nowhere in the *earlier* Jaina texts, whether Śvetāmbara or Digambara[4], is he mentioned by the name Gŏmmateśvara, Gŏmmata-jina etc Likewise the title *Gommaṭasāra* given to that book does not in any way indicate the contents, the significant name of the text being *Pañcasaṃgraha*[5]

The Belgola image is the earliest of these three statues,[6] and as yet no passage in Jaina literature or anywhere else has been brought to light to show that Bāhubali was called Gŏmmateśvara prior to the time of the erection of Beḷgoḷa image Subsequent to its erection, there are many references to the image as Gŏmmateśvara both in the epigraphic and literary records Many inscriptions at Śravana Beḷgoḷa[7] mention the image as Gŏmmata-deva, +īśvarajina, +īśajina, +īśa, — nātha, — jinendra, — jinapa, — svāmi, +īsvara, +iśvarasvāmi etc , and very rarely simply as Gŏmmaṭa The spelling shows some vowel-variation Gŏmmata, Gummaṭa and Gŏmata, but the word is undoubtedly the same Inscriptions afford some corrupt forms as well Gŏmattesvara, Gummanātha-svāmi[8], and these may be taken as scribal errors The name of the text, however, is uniformly *Gommatasāra*

The word Gŏmmata, in both the places, has to be explained identically for various reasons It was Cāmundarāya, the minister and general of the Ganga king Rājamalla (A D 974-984), that was responsible for the installation of the image at Beḷgoḷa[9] and accord-

* Published in the Bhāratiya Vidyā, II, i, pp 48-58, Bombay 1940

1 This paper is prepared during my tenure of the Springer Research Scholarship, University of Bombay

2 *Epigraphia Carnatica* II (Revised Ed), Intro pp 10-18, 1920

3 Available in two parts, *Jīvakāṇḍa* and *Karmakāṇḍa*, Rāyachandra Jaina Śāstramālā, Bombay 1916 and 1928

4 *Abhidhāna-rājendra* is as good as an encyclopaedia of Śvetāmbara literature, and it does not mention any early sources in giving information about Gomaṭhadeva What we are anonymously told is that it stands for an image of Ṛṣabha in the Kaliṅga country in the North and for that of Bāhubali in the South (Vol III, Ratlam 1913, p 934) The Digambara sources are fully utilised in the Introduction to *E C* II (ed RN)

5 *Dravyasaṃgraha*, Sacred Books of the Jainas I, Arrah 1919, Intro p 40

6 The Beḷgoḷa image was possibly consecrated in 983 A D , that of Kārkaḷa in 1432 A D , and that of Veṇūra in 1604 A D

7 These remarks are based on my analysis of the references noted in the Index to E C II op cit

8 *E C* II, Nos 377, 352 (Ed RN)

9 *E C* II, Intro p 15 (ibid).

ing to the tradition recorded by commentators[10] it was for this Cāmuṇḍarāya that Nemicandra compiled *Gommatasāra* gathering the contents from earlier texts like *Dhavalā* Though no definite dates are available, this much is certain that Nemicandra and Cāmundarāya were contemporaries and the erection of the image and the composition of *Gommaṭasāra* are contemporary events associated nearly with the same locality So any sense that we attach to the word *Gommaṭā* must fit in the name of the colossus and also in the name of the Prākrit work

That Cāmundarāya is associated with the Belgoḷa image as well as with the Prākrit work is an important fact If we carefully study some of the concluding gāthās of *Gommaṭasāra*,[11] one fact is undisputable that Cāmundarāya, who bore the title Vīramārtaṇḍa, had another name Gŏmmaṭa and was also called Gŏmmaṭa Rāya Nemicandra has wished victory to him in glowing terms A scrutiny of these verses and the commentary thereon shows that the word *Gommata* is often repeated with slightly different shades of meaning This repetition of the word, it appears to me, is only another way of glorifying Gŏmmata or Cāmundarāya Jinasena also had glorified Vīrasena in this manner[12] Besides this contemporary evidence, we learn from an inscription of A D 1180 that Cāmundarāya had another name Gŏmmata[13] To me it appears that it might have been a household name of Cāmundarāya

Remembering the facts that Bāhubali is not called Gŏmmatesvara in early Jaina literature and that the term became current only after the installation of the Belgola image, it is easily believable that the image became famous as Gŏmmateśvara (*Gommatasya īśvaraḥ*, a Tatpurusa compound), 'the deity of Gŏmmata', because it was erected by Cāmundarāya alias Gŏmmaṭa We have similar cases of deities named after the founders of the temples Nīlakaṇṭheśvaradeva, Laksmaneśvara, and Śankeśvaradeva are the names given to deities consecrated by Nīlakantha-nāyaka (Śaka 1051), Laksmana and Śankara-camūnātha[14] And *Gommatasāra* was so named because it was a summary (*sāra*) or the condensed purport of *Dhavalā* etc , specially prepared by Nemicandra for Gŏmmata or Cāmundarāya Once the Beḷgola image was known as Gŏmmateśvara, gradually the name came to be understood as a Karmadhāraya compound (*Gommataścāsau īśvaraḥ*)[15] and later on applied to other statues of Bāhubali at Kārkal and Venūr That they imitate the Belgola image is a fact

[10] See the opening remarks of Abhayacandra, Keśavavarni and Nemicandra The Kannada commentary of Keśavavarni is not yet published The Sk Commentaries of Abhayacandra and Nemicandra (who closely follows Keśavavarni) are published in the Gāndhī-Haribhāi-Devakarana-Jaina-Granthamālā, 4, Calcutta

[11] *Jīvakānda* 733 and *Karmakānda* 965-72 These gāthās have been critically translated (into English) by me with historical notes etc , in my paper 'Material on the Interpretation of the word Gommaṭa' contributed to Poussin Number, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol XVI, No 2 Cf previous article, pp 211-216

[12] See my paper noted in the above foot-note, *Saṭkhaṇḍāgamah*, Vol I, ed , by Prof HIRALAL JAINA, Amraoti 1939, Intro p 37, foot-note 1, verse 17

[13] *E C* II (Ed RN), No 234, line 16, also p 98 of the English Summary

[14] K G KUNDANGAR *Inscriptions in Northern Karnataka and the Kolhapur State*, Kolhapur 1939, pp 18, 65, 40 etc

[15] *Gommaṭa* in its general sense 'pleasing', see *E C* II (Ed RN), No 234, (A D 1180), line 52, where this word is used in the sense 'pleasing' Possibly it means 'excellent' also, see ibid , No 251 (A D 1118), line 31, the first occurrence, and No 345 (A D 1159) line 50, the second occurrence. I have quoted the extracts below

Though Gŏmmata is a proper name in the case of Cāmundarāya, let us see what this term means and whether any light can be shed on its etymology We have no evidence to say that the word *gommaṭa or gummata* is of Sanskritic origin The form *gomata*, which occurs conspicuously in the Devanāgarī inscriptions at Beḷgoḷa, is only an attempt to bring it nearer the Sanskrit phonology[16]. Among the Modern Indian Languages, it is in Marāṭhī that this word is frequently used and is still current

(*i*) In the text of Dṛṣṭānta-pāṭha, usually assigned to circa Śaka 1200, the word *gomaṭa* occurs

(1) वोखटें करीतयांतें म्हणी गोमटेयातें न पवे ।
गोमटे करीतयांतें म्हणी वोखटे यातें न पवे ॥ दृष्टांत १०[17]

(2) तो म्हणे । कसा बापुडा । गोरा गोमटा । धारे धाकुटा ।
राणीयेचा पूत ऐसा दीसतु असे ॥ दृष्टांत १३.

(*ii*) This word is repeatedly used in *Jñāneśvarī* (Śaka 1212), and Mr PAI has already noted some of the references [18] I may quote a few passages here [19]

(1) जैसें आंधलेया अव्हांटा । का माजवणदान मर्कटा ।
तैसा उपदेशु हा गोमटा । ओडवला अम्हा ॥ ३-९.

(2) हे सायास देखां मोटे । आता कैसेनि पां येकोल फीटे ।
म्हणौनि योगी मार्ग गोमटे । शोधिले दोन्ही ॥ ८-२४३

(3) तैसे मीं वांचूनि काहीं । अणिक गोमटें चि नाहीं ।
मज चि नावें पाइं । जीणें ठेविलें ॥ ९-३३२.

(4) वोखटें ना गोमटें । या काइसेया ही न भेटे ।
रात्रि देखो न घटे । सूर्यु जैसा ॥ १२-१९४.

(5) तेया परीं कपिध्वजा । या मरणार्णवा समजा ।
पासौनि निगति वोजा । गोमटिया ॥ १३-१०४०.

(6) नाना सुद्रव्यें गोमटीं । जालेयां शरीरा पैठीं ।
होउनि ठाकति किरीटी । मलु चि जैवि ॥ १८-७४.

The number of illustrations can be easily multiplied Then this word is used in *Amṛtānubhava*[20] also

(1) सहाय आत्मविद्येचे । करावाया आपण वेचे ।
गोमटे काय शब्दाचे । एकैक वानूं ॥ ६-११

[16] *F C* II (Ed RN), Nos 192, 248, 277, of course it is not implied that the form Gomaṭa is not found in Sanskrit and Kannaḍa inscriptions written in Kannaḍa characters

[17] I owe these extracts to my friend Prof V B KOLATE, Amraoti

[18] See his Kannaḍa booklet *Śrī Bāhubali Gomaṭeśvara Carita*, Mangalore 1939 p 30, footnote 27

[19] V K RAJAVADE *Jñāneśvarī*, Dhule Śaka 1831

[20] K. K GARDE *Śrī Amṛtānubhava*, Bombay 1929

(iii) We find that this word is used in *Śiśupālavadha*[21] of Bhāskara (Śaka 1195) also

(1) सरोवरां निहटी । घातली सोनकेतकीची ताटी ।
बरी मांडवी उभिली गोमटी । पांच वर्णेया परागाची ॥ ६५२.

(iv) The word Gŏmaṭa was in common use in the Marāṭhā period as seen from its occurrence in letters contemporary of Shivāji In a letter[22] of A D 1677, addressed by Shivāji to Maloji Ghorpade we get three sentences [23]

(1) तुम्ही मराठे लोक आपले आहा. तुमचे गोमटें व्हावें म्हणून पष्ठच तुम्ह स लिहिले असे

(2) सर्व प्रकारें तुमचें गोमटें करून, एविसी आम्हां पासून अंतर पडे तरी व मागील दावियाचा किंतु आम्ही मनांतून टाकीला एविसी आम्हास नी देवाची आण असे

(3) आम्ही सर्व प्रकारे तुमचें गोमटें करावयासी अंतर पडो नेदऊन

In these sentences the word is capable of explaining itself from the context In present Marāthi it means '*bare karane*', 'to do good' In fact the same letter gives a sentence which expresses the above meaning in other words

(1) आपल्या जातीच्या मराठिया लोकाचे बरें करावें हे आपणास उचित आहे

It means that Shivāji wishes for their socio-political welfare, in short, general well-being

(v) Mr PAI has already noted an instance from the Abhangas of Tukārāma who often uses this word

(1) जडोनी गोमटी नाना रत्नै । १००

Even to-day we have the Marāṭhī idiom '*gorā gomaṭā*', and one suspects whether this might be after all a doublet The above usages, selected at random, are enough to show that the word *gomata* is an adjective in Marāthī, and it means 'fair', 'handsome', 'attractive', 'good' etc The Konkanī dialect also possesses the word *gomto*, and it means the same as in Marāthī

The use of this word in Kannada literature is not explored There are, however, three passages in the Inscriptions at Śravana Beḷgoḷa, and the records belong to A D 1118, 1159 and 1180 respectively They are reproduced here [24]

(1) गोम्मटमेने मुनिसमुदा-
य मनदोळु मेचि सुसं
गोम्मटदेवर पूजेग-
दं मुदर्दि बिट्टनल्ते धीरोदात्तं ।

[21] V L BHAVE *Śiśupāla-vadha*, Thana Śaka 1848

[22] My friend Prof Dr A G PAWAR, Kolhapur, kindly drew my attention to this record

[23] *Śivakālina-patrasārasamgraha*, Vol 2, Poona 1930, Letter No 1901, pp 559-61

[24] *E C* II (Ed RN), 251, 345 and 234

(2) गोम्मटपुरभूषणमिदु
गोम्मटमाप्तेने समस्तपरिकरसहितं ।
सन्मदद्वि हुळचमू-
पं माडिसिदं जिनोत्तमालयमनिदं ॥

(3) तम्मने पोदरेअनुजरेळकमेय्दे तपके नीनुमिं-
तम्म तपक बोदोडेनगीसिरियोप्पदु बेडेनुतुम-
ण्नं मनमिल्दु मन्नुमिगेयुं बगेगोळदे दीक्षेगोंडे नी-
गोम्मटदेव निम तरिसंदळवार्येजनके गोम्मटं ॥

In these passages it means 'pleasing' 'excellent' Besides it occurs in many proper names[25] Telugu gives us a word *gummadu* which means 'one who decks himself' In South Kanara the image of Gŏmmata-deva is popularly called 'Gummaḍa Devar' In Tamil we have a word *kummtta* but as far as I see it has no semantic connection with *Gommata* The origin and the etymology of this word deserve further study Perhaps the word comes from the South Indian stock It is not possible to connect it easily with any Sanskrit root There is however the Dhātvādeśa *gummada* equated with the root *muh* by the Prākrit grammarians[26], and it is not unlikely if our word comes from this Dhātvādeśa with the causal meaning Thus all that we know about this word is that the earliest occurrence of the word, apart from the proper names, is in a Kannaḍa Inscription of A D 1118, that the word is often used in Marāthī literature, and it is current even to-day in Marāṭhī and Konkanī, and the meanings attached to this word do show a semantic connection I do hope that some linguist would throw more light on this word It is quite plain that the word *gommata* should not be confused with another word spelt as *gumat* etc , used in various Modern Indian languages to signify a cupola, dome, arch, vault, arched roof and so forth The latter comes from the Persian *gumbad>gummaj* and it is pronounced *gummat, ghumta* and so forth

The consonant *t* in the word *gommaṭa* is not changed to *d* even in the Prākrit verses of *Gommatasāra* It may be justified to a certain extent on the ground that it was a personal and popular name of Cāmunḍa Rāya , and as such it is retained as a proper name

Thus I conclude that Gŏmmaṭa was a personal name of Cāmunḍarāya, the image of Bāhubali being respectfully installed by him came to be called Gŏmmateśvara, and lastly the summary of *Dhavalā* etc , prepared for him by Nemicandra was called *Gommatasāra.* Literally the word means 'excellent' etc

Before I finish this article it is necessary for me to review some of the discussions of earlier scholars who have touched the various aspects of the above subject and have arrived at different conclusions though the facts are the same

Pt PREMI remarks[27] 'On account of the image of Gŏmmateśa Cāmundarāya became so famous that he came to be called Gŏmmatarāya' PREMIJI has not given any reasons

[25] Gommaṭapura, Gommaṭaseṭṭi etc , see the Index to *E C* II, Gummaṭadeva (*Kavicarite* I, 196)

[26] Hemacandra's Prākrit Grammar VIII. iv 207 and *Deśīnāmamālā* II, 92-93, also Trivikrama's Grammar III, i, 131

[27] *Trilokasāra*, Māṇikachandra D J Granthamālā No 12, Bombay Saṃvat 1975, Intro p 8.

for his conclusion; so I may just note down the difficulties against such a conclusion. No evidence is brought forth to show that Bāhubali was called Gŏmmaṭa before the erection of the Belgoḷa image Rāya was a well-known title of Cāmuṇḍarāya, and if it is supposed that Gŏmmata meant Bāhubali, how can we explain the compound Gŏmmatarāya? The image is usually called Gŏmmata-deva, -nātha etc, and very rarely and in later records simply as Gŏmmaṭa I think, PREMIJI's conclusion needs further proofs in the absence of which it cannot be accepted

Explaining the name and origin of *Gommatasāra*, J. L. JAINI says,[28] 'The author has called Śrī Vardamāna or Mahāvīra by the name of Gŏmmatadeva The word Gŏmmaṭa is probably derived from '*go*' speech, and '*mata*' or '*matha*' abode meaning 'the Abode of speech', the Lord from whom flows the letterless voice, the wonderful music, Divya-dhvani Sāra means the essence, the condensed purport The word *Gommatasāra* would thus mean the 'Essence of Discourses of Lord Mahāvīra ' Cāmunda Rāya was also called Rājā Gŏmmaṭa most probably on account of his great devotion to Śrī Gŏmmata Deva or Lord Mahāvīra. As a compliment to the Great questioner (viz, Cāmunda Rāya), the compilation has been called *Gommatasāra* after his name' I have explained elsewhere[29] in what sense Gŏmmata-deva could be equated with Mahāvīra As long as it is not proved that Gŏmmata is a Sanskrit word, any attempt to give a Sanskrit etymology is irrelevant It may exhibit only the grammatical ingeniousness of the writer and nothing more, but such speculations, howsoever amusing, have no place in sober history and etymology Perhaps JAINI is following some Sanskrit commentator

Mr M GOVIND PAI[30] has written an exhaustive article on this subject, and his views have been often repeated by himself[31] and others in the last few years Though rich in information, his paper is full of dubious and speculative deductions from his own interpretations of facts and negative evidences, and one often suspects that he is arguing in a vicious circle taking probabilities as facts Many direct and indirect issues are mixed up, and some of his reservations and questions are far from being consistent However, the following points appear plain to me in his discussion, and I shall enumerate them in his own words as far as possible

1 Bāhubali being a Kāmadeva could be called Manmatha of which Gŏmmata is a Tadbhava in Kanarese (or in Konkanī, according to his postscript) which probably borrowed it from Marāṭhī

2 Beḷgoḷa image, installed in 981 A D, had not become famous as Gŏmmateśvara till 993 A D, because *Ajitapurāṇa* of Ranna mentions the image as Kukkuteśvara and not Gŏmmaṭeśvara

3 Cāmundarāya had no name as Gŏmmaṭa, or -rāya till at least 933 A D because Beḷgoḷa inscription No 281, *Cāmundarāya-purāṇa* and *Cāritrasāra* do not mention any such name

[28] *Gommaṭasāra-Jīvakāṇḍa*, with English Translation etc, by J L JAINI, SBJ V, Intro, pp 5-6, I have added the necessary diacritical points in this passage

[29] See my paper 'Material on the Interpretation of the word Gommaṭa', IHQ, Vol XVI, No 2 Cf previous article

[30] *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol IV, No 2, pp 270-86

[31] *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara*, Arrah, IV, ii, pp 102-109, *Śrī Bāhubali Gomaṭeśvara Caritra*, Mangalore 1939; *Jaina Antiquary*, Arrah, VI, i, pp 26-34, etc.

4. According to Doḍḍayya's *Bhujabalisataka* (A.D 1550) the Gōmmata of Paudanupura (erected there by Bharata) manifested himself on Vindhyagiri. So the name of the image was Gōmmaṭa since long, and Cāmunḍarāya not being called Gōmmaṭa, it can be said that Cāmunḍarāya got his name from that of the image

5 Neither the image nor Cāmundarāya had any name as Gōmmata at the time of the installation, because the contemporary inscriptions do not mention anything. Cāmundarāya had a title Rāya.

6 *Gommatasāra*, which mentions Gōmmaṭa as a name of Cāmunḍarāya, must have been written after 993 A D , and *Trilokasāra*, which does not mention this, might have been composed between 981-84 A D

7 Nemicandra himself gave the name Gōmmaṭa to Cāmundarāya from that of the image after it was installed It is unlikely that Cāmunḍarāya being old could be called Gōmmaṭa which has a sensual sense meaning Manmatha

8 The image was the first to be called Gōmmata, and this explains terms like Gōmmata-jina, Gōmmata-pura etc

9 If the Beḷgola image was called Gōmmaṭadeva from the name of the installer, the Kārkal and Venūr images should also have been called after the names of their installer, but as they too are called Gōmmata, it must have been the name of Bāhubali

Let us now see the validity of these conclusions and the cogency of the arguments

1 Bāhubali being a Kāmadeva could be called Manmatha that is acceptable, but the linguistic equation *manmatha=gammaha=gommata* is the weakest stone in the grandiose structure of Mr PAI's essay Prof K G KUDANGAR had rightly questioned the validity of this equation, but Mr PAI, without adding further evidence to strengthen his position, treated him with a sarcastic foot-note[32] which has evoked a long and learned note from Prof KUNDANGAR[33] who has conclusively shown that *manmatha=gammaha* has no support in the entire range of Prākrt grammatic literature, that one isolated case in *Prākṛta-mañjari* a late commentary on Vararuci's Sūtras, being a misprint that could be easily detected by a careful study of the relevant sūtras and by comparing their interpretation in earlier commentaries To establish his equation Mr PAI argues like this

'In the 'Prākrtamañjarī' of Kātyāyana, the rule governing the change that the double sound 'nm' undergoes is laid down as 'nmo mah' (III 42) wherefore the Sanskrit word 'Manmatha' meaning 'cupid' becomes 'Gammaha' in Prākrit (1) The sounds of the dental class, when final in a Sanskrit word, change into cerebrals in Kanarese—S Granthi (a knot) =K Ganṭi (or Ganṭu), S Śraddhā (confidence, trust, faith)=K Saḍde, S tāna (in music)=K tāna, S. pattana (a city)=K paṭṭana, S path (patha)=K baṭṭe etc , therefore the final 'th' of the word 'Manmatha' would not retain in Kanarese the final 'h' sound it has in the Prākrt (Gammaha), but would naturally change into a 'ṭ', and thus the S 'Manmatha' =Pkt Gammaha would become, in its Kanarese Tadbhave form, 'Gammaṭa'. (2) In Kanarese words, the inital 'a' sound alternates with the short 'o' (as in the English word

[32] In his Kannaḍa booklet noted above

[33] Prof KUNDANGAR's article is awaiting publication with *Karṇāṭaka Sāhitya Pariṣatpatrike*, Bangalore

'not') sound—e.g., (1) magu (a child)=mogu, mammaga (grandson)=mommaga; magacu (to subvert)=mogacu, tappalu (valley)=toppalu, daḍḍi (cowshed)=doḍḍi, sappu (dry leaves)=soppu, maḷa (a cubit)=moḷa etc Therefore it is an easy and inevitable passage from Gammaṭa to Gŏmmata' etc

Prākṛtamañjarī is a late commentary on the Sūtras of Vararuci (according to some, the same as Kātyāyana), so it is wrong to attribute this commentary to Kātyāyana Mr PAI silently passes over another specific sūtra *manmathe vah* (ii 36) according to which the initial *m* is changed to *v* in the word *manmatha* The reading *gammaha* given in the commentary is a plain error or a misprint for the following reasons (*i*) Sūtra iii 42 lays down the change of *nm* and has nothing to do with the change of initial *m*, (*ii*) the change of initial *m* into *v* is specifically dictated by the Sūtra ii 36, (*iii*) and lastly, as shown by Prof KUNDANGAR, the form *gammaha* is noted neither by any other commentator on the same sūtras nor by any other Prākrit grammar or lexicon The usual Prākrit word is *vammaha* for *manmatha*. Unless the equation *manmatha=gammaha* is proved to be valid, all the following arguments are valueless Further the analogies like *śraddhā*, *granthi* etc , are no real parallels, because they are subject to phonetic rules like the cerebral law which do not affect the word *manmatha* His reasoning may appear to be formally correct, but it is all deceptive philology I think, Mr PAI is not quite aware of the pitfalls of analogical reasoning especially in the field of Prākrits and Modern Indian languages. If his method is adopted, any word may be changed into any form By stepping into the footsteps of the logic adopted by Mr PAI, I may show that even *kukkuta* can be equated with *gommata* or *gummata* when Sanskrit words are taken into Kannada, the initial *k* is often changed to *g*, for instance, *kuti=gudi*, *kote=gode* etc (*Śabda-maṇi-darpana* 256) In Prākrit *k* is changed to *m* in the word *candrikā* (*Prākrta-mañjarī* ii 5), so a duplicate *kk* can be changed into *mm* The vowel *u* is sometimes changed to *a* in Kannada *kustumburu*=*kottumbari* (*SM* 287), *mānuṣyam*=*mānsam* *SM* 273) Thus *kukkuta* is changed to *gummata* Mr PAI cannot object to this procedure, as he himself has adopted it But this is all joking with phonetics and running amuck on the slippery ground of philological speculation So Mr PAI's equation *manmatha=gammaha* is not at all proved

2 If Mr PAI starts with the equation Bāhubali=Kāmadeva=Manmatha>Gŏmmaṭa, though unproved as seen above, it is a self-contradiction to say that the image could not have been called Gŏmmateśvara till 981 or 993 A D Bāhubali is known as Kāmadeva from pretty early times So either Mr PAI should give up the equation or admit that Bāhubali was called Gŏmmaṭa from early times If he adopts the second alternative, he will have to show early passages in which Bāhubali is called Gŏmmateśvara He might say that Bharata had erected the image of Gŏmmaṭa at Paudanapura, but for this there is no contemporary evidence, and he is relying on the statement of Doḍḍayya who flourished in the middle of the 16th century A D That Ranna mentions Kukkuteśvara and not Gŏmmateśvara does not prove anything, because it is not a positive evidence If we take into account self-consistency and the interpretation of the commentators, even *Gommatasāra* mentions Kukkuta Jina and not Gŏmmateśvara to designate Bāhubali If Doḍḍayya does not call Cāmuṇḍa Rāya by the name Gŏmmata, are we justified in saying that Gŏmmaṭa Rāya was not his name at all upto 1550 A D.? In fact one of Mr. PAI's remarks implies this position.

3. Again this is a case of negative evidence and of an argument exsilentio which do not prove anything As I have suggested above, Gŏmmata appears to have been a personal name of Cāmuṇḍa Rāya, and as such may not figure everywhere, nor do the records claim that they are enumerating all the names of Cāmunda Rāya

4 By admitting that the Paudanapura image was called Gŏmmata on the authority of *Bhujabali-śataka* of Dŏddayya (A D 1550), MR PAI is only contradicting his another conclusion that the image was not known as Gŏmmata upto 981 or 993 A D He forgets that he is using a record of the 16th century to prove a fact of Bharata's time

5 A negative evidence and an argument exsilentio do not prove anything

6 We do not know the exact dates of the composition of *Gommatasāra* and *Triloka-sāra*, nor are there any definite evidences to arrive at them These dates are proposed by MR PAI himself from the mention or the non-mention of the name Gŏmmata, and we would be arguing in a vicious circle, if we take the support of these dates to settle the limits of the period of the usage of the word Gŏmmata as a name for Bāhubali

7 We have no evidence to say that Nemicandra gave the name Gŏmmata to Cāmunda Rāya, and I fear that the plain fact is being slightly twisted here All that we know is that Nemicandra mentions Gŏmmata as a name of Cāmunda Rāya, and this does not prohibit the position that he had already a name like that That Cāmunda Rāya got the name from that of the image would be acceptable only when it is first proved that Bāhubali had a name Gŏmmata before the erection of the Belgola image The equation Manmatha=Gŏmmata has already failed, nor Dŏddayya's reference to Paudanapura Gŏmmata can come to our rescue That Gŏmmata has a sensual meaning is deduced from the above equation which is already exploded, and as such the argument loses all force That Cāmunda Rāya was old and therefore could not have been called Gŏmmata is a meaningless argument that presupposes certain evidences which are either exploded above or not at all available

8 The equation Manmatha =Gŏmmata not being established, it remains still unproved that Bāhubali had a name Gŏmmata But on the other hand, *Gommatasāra* definitely gives Gŏmmata as a name of Cāmunda Rāya, and his deity, the statue of Bāhubali could be called Gŏmmateśvara etc Gŏmmata-jina mentioned by *Gommatasāra* has nothing to do with Bāhubali [34] I do admit the possibility that once the image became famous as Gŏmmata-deva many things could be associated with this name in later days

9 MR PAI himself has answered this question at the beginning of his article, and I might only quote his words to refute his heated argument 'It may also be noted here that the *earliest* of the three colossi, viz, the one installed by Cāmunda Rāya (or Cāvunda Rāya) at Śrāvana Belgola, first came to be popularly called by the name "Gŏmmata" etc (or "Gommateśvara" etc,), and when in course of time, similar colossi were installed at Kārkaḷa and Venur, they also were called alike after their great archetype at Śrāvana Beḷgoḷa ' By asking why the last two are not named after their founders, he only contradicts his earlier statement which is more reasonable

[34] See my article 'Material on the Interpretation of the Word Gommata' *IHQ*. Vol. XVI, No 2, Cf previous article

Besides these main arguments, there are many other minor points which have no direct bearing on the present topic, so they do not require any elaborate refutation His speculations on the phonology of Gōmatta, his remark that Konkani was derived from Māgadhi or Ardha-Māgadhī etc , do not deserve to be taken too seriously.

PT. A SHANTIRAJ SHASTRI[35] has lately touched this topic in a short note, and on many points we are in agreement. He too says that Nemicandra has called Bāhubali by the name Gōmaṭa, but he has not quoted any specific passage to prove his remark To explain the change of ḍ to ṭ in the word *gummada*, he quotes Sūtra No III, ii. 65 from Trivikrama's Prākrit grammar, but I must point out that it is a specific sūtra meant only for the Cūlikā-Paiśācī dialect and it cannot be applied anywhere and everywhere. This change can be explained by saying that either it might imply the tendency to Sanskritise the word, or it is an illustration of the tendency of some South Indian languages which often harden the soft consonants After all this is a probable explanation. It is however certain that we are not justified in applying that Sūtra to the present case

MR. K P. MITRA[36] has lately contributed a paper on Bāhubali Though he follows MR. PAI in many respects in his discussion about Gōmmaṭa, he rightly remarks in footnote that *mammaha* or *vammaha* is the recognised equivalent of *manmatha* and he leaves it as an open question whether *gammaha* could be equated with *manmatha*

[35] *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara* VII, i, p 51 and his Kannaḍa booklet, *Śri Gommaṭeśvara Carita*, Mysore 1940

[36] *The Jaina Antiquary*, Vol. VI, i, p 33

HASTIMALLA AND HIS ĀDIPURĀṆA*[1]

AUFRECHT in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* (Leipzig 1891), p 764, mentions an author Hastimallasena He is described as a Jaina, and the following works are attributed to him (1) *Arjunarāja-nāṭaka* (OPPERT II, 316), (2) *Udayanarāja-kāvya* (OPPERT II, 421), (3) *Bharatarāja-nāṭaka* (OPPERT II, 325), (4) *Megheśvara-nāṭaka* (OPPERT II, 326) and (5) *Maithilīpariṇaya-nāṭaka* (OPPERT II, 327) Further we are informed that other poems and plays of his are in existence He has drawn his information from OPPERT's 'Lists of Sanskrit Mss in Private Libraries of Southern India, Vols I, II, Madras 1880-85' Against *Udayanarāja-kāvya* AUFRECHT mentions Mallasena, elsewhere Hastimallasena M KRISHNAMACHRIAR[2] writes, not without some hesitation, the name simply as Hastimalla, and attributes to him, besides the above works, some more compositions (6) *Ādipurāṇa*, (7) *Purucarita*, (8) *Subhadrāharaṇa*, (9) *Añjanā-pavanañjaya* and (10) *Vikrānta-kaurava* R NARASIMHACHARYA[3] has noted *Ādipurāṇa* of Hastimalla, composed in A D 1290, on the authority of K B PATHAK, but no exact reference to his article is given Another work (11) *Śrīpurāṇa* is also attributed to Hastimalla, and the Mss of this, I learn, exist in the Jaina Mathas of Mudabidri and Varanga in South Kanara

Of these works Nos 5 and 10 are already published,[4] and I have examined three Mss of No 9 and two Mss of No 8[5] No 5 is known by the names *Maithilīkalyāṇam* and *Sītā-nāṭaka*, No 8 is known as *Subhadrā-nāṭakā*(*-nāṭikā?*), and No 10 as *Sulocanā-nāṭakam* From these four Sanskrit plays, we get the following details about Hastimalla.

Hastimalla's spiritual lineage is traced back to Samantabhadra, the moon is in the sky of Mūlasaṃgha, a future Tīrthakara, the author of *Gandhahasti*, a commentary on *Tattvārtha-sūtra* and of *Devāgama* and an unsurmountable disputant He had two pupils, Śivakoṭi and Śivāyana, that had studied the entire scripture at his feet In that line was born Vīrasena, an outstanding personality free from internal impurities, well-versed in scriptures and a foremost logician The great monk Jinasena received instructions from him and became his prominent pupil, and his Purāṇa is well-known in the world His beloved pupil was the monk Guṇabhadra who glorified the Śalākāpuruṣas Three verses are found at the end of a Ms of *Subhadrā-nāṭikā* in which one Prabhendu or Prabhācandra is glorified, but his exact relation with Hastimalla's line is not at all clear

Turning to the domestic details, as time passed on, in this succession of pupils of Guṇabhadra there was one Govindabhaṭṭa of Vatsa Gotra who came to be endowed with

* Published in the Kaṇe Felicitation Volume, pp 526-29, Poona 1941

[1] This Paper is prepared during my tenure of the Springer Research Scholarship, University of Bombay

[2] *Classical Sanskrit Literature*, Madras, 1937, pp 641, 1114

[3] *Kavicarite*, Vol I, Bangalore, 1924, p 399

[4] Māṇikachandra D Jaina Granthamālā, Bombay, Nos 3 and 5 There is a short Introduction giving a few details about the author

[5] I am collecting the Mss of these two Sanskrit plays with a view to edit them

right faith (in Jainism) by hearing *Devāgamanasūtra* He had six sons all staying in the South (*dākṣiṇātyāḥ*) and flourishing through the favour of Svarnayakṣī (*Jayanty atra Svarnayakṣī-prasādataḥ*); and their names are Śrī Kumāra-kavi, Satyavākya, Devaravallabha, Udayabhūṣana, Hastimalla and Vardhamāna All these were poets The last verse of the Praśasti, as I understand it, is a prayer offered to Vrsabhanātha, consecrated at Dvīpamgudi, profusely respected by Hastimalla and saluted by some Pāndya king This Hastimalla (-Bhaṭṭa) was the son of Govinda (with the suffix-bhatta or with the prefix Bhaṭṭāra-) and he had six brothers, himself being the fifth in order His father appears to have been a convert to Jainism after hearing *Devāgama-stotra* of Samantabhadra His brother Satyavākya is the author of various compositions, but only one work is mentioned by Hastimalla, namely, *Śrīmatī-kalyāna*[6] From the verse found in *Añjanā-pavanañjaya* we learn that Hastimalla lived under the patronage of some Pāndya king who had subdued Karnāṭaka

Brahmasūri,[7] the author of *Pratiṣṭhā-tilaka*, belonged to the family of Hastimalla Besides giving the above details he adds some more facts Pārśvapandita was the son of Hastimalla, and he was well-known for his learning and piety For some reason or other, he migrated to the town of Chatra-traya-puri in the Hoysala territory, and there he lived with all his relatives He had three sons Candrapa, Candranātha and Vaijayya Candranātha and his family stayed at Hemācala, while his other brothers migrated elsewhere Brahmasūri was the grandson of Candrapa

All that we can say about the chronology of his works is that Hastimalla wrote *Añjanā-pavanañjaya* earlier than *Maithilī-kalyānam*

As to Hastimalla's age, he is later than Gunabhadra who finished his *Uttarapurāna* in A D 897 *Jinendra-kalyānābhyudaya* of Ayyapārya refers to the fact that our author got the name Hastimalla after he controlled the mad elephant let loose on him by the Pāndya king at Saranyāpura, and to a certain extent this is confirmed by verse No 40, Act I, of *Vikrānta-kaurava* Ayyapārya wrote his work in Vikrama Samvat 1376 (—57=1319) So Hastimalla flourished between A D 897 and 1319 This is still a wide range indeed PATHAK and NARASIMHACHARYA have assigned A D 1290 to Hastimalla, but their conclusion is not accompanied by the necessary evidence M KRISHNAMACHARIAR opines that Hastimalla probably lived in the 9th century A D, but he too has not given any evidence The identification of Dvīpamgudi, Saranyāpura and the Pāndya king is an urgent desideratum, and I draw the attention of South Indian scholars to these points which, when cleared, will help us to settle the date of Hastimalla definitely

R NARASIMHACHARYA has noted that the Ms of *Ādipurāna* did not reach his hands Lately I have come across a paper Ms of it from which I would give some details about it here It is a bulky volume of country paper stitched at the left end and measures about 9 5 by 8 inches The first 41 leaves are devoted to *Ādipurāna*, and the remaining portion covers some cantos of *Bharateśavaibhava* (Kannada) written in disorder, *Daśalakṣanapūjā* (Sanskrit), *Mānikasvāmicarite* (Kannada) and some ritualistic treatises

The first leaf is torn, so we cannot know how the text began *Ādipurāna* is divided into ten Parvans and written throughout in Kannada prose Beginning with the divisions

[6] See the Prastāvanā of *Maithilī-kalyānam*

[7] *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara*, VII, i, Praśasti Samgraha, p 161

of time, with Kalpavrksas and Manus etc , and passing through the previous births of the first Tirthankara, the details of the life of Vrsabha are given in a traditional manner up to his liberation.

In the various colophons the name of the work is mentioned as ***Pūrva-purāna-kathā***, but at the end it is called *Ādipurāna* Kannada Grantha The Kannada verse at the beginning of the second Parvan suggests that *Purudevacarita* also might have been its name. So we may take that Nos 6 and 7 stand for one and the same work The name of the author is mentioned as Hastimallisenācārya in two colophons and as Hastimalli-sūri[8] in eight colophons, and there can be no doubt that both the forms of the name refer to the same individual No date of the author is given in this Ms The title of the author *ubhaya-bhāṣa-cakravarti* is present in every colophon The colophon at the end of the tenth Parvan runs thus

यित्युभयभाषाचक्रवर्त्तिहस्तिमल्लिसूरिविरचितपूर्वपुराणमहाकथायां दशमपर्व ॥

Every Parvan begins with a Sanskrit verse which is the same as the opening Mangala of the *Ādipurāna* (Sanskrit) of Jinasena There is an additional Kannada verse at the beginning of the Canto Two

श्रीपुरुदेवन कथेयं
पापहरमनखिलजीवतति तिळियल् सं-
क्षेपदोळतिमृदुवाक्यद-
रूपदि वरेदं सुमुक्तिभरदिं गुरुवं ॥

The work closes with the following verse

श्रीमच्चमारसिंहविष्टरवरच्छत्रत्रयाशोकदि-
व्यामेयध्वनिपुष्पवृष्टिसुरभेरीभूरिभामंडल-
स्तोमं भास्वदनन्तबोधनिळयं हृत्सौख्यलक्ष्मीसमु-
दामं माळ्केमगळ्करिंदे शुभमंनोवर्धमानं जिनं ॥[9]

This Ms is written at Ainapur (in the Belgaum Dt) by Padmanna Upādhyāya in Śaka 1625 (+78=1703 A D), Svabhānu Samvatsara, Mārgaśīrsa Śuklapakṣa, Daśamī, Somavāra etc It has not been well-preserved At present it is in the possession of MR GUNDAPPA TAVANAPPA ARAVADE, Sangli, who kindly allowed me to make use of it for this paper

In view of the facts that *Ādipurāna* qualifies its author with the title *ubhaya-bhāṣa-cakravarti* which possibly refers to his proficiency in Sanskrit and Kannada, that one verse from *Añjanā-pavanañjaya* associates him with Karnātaka, and that Devacandra took both

[8] Malli for Malla might have been a scribal error

[9] I have made one or two minor corrections in these verses

of them to be identical, I am inclined to believe that the author of Kannada *Ādipurāna* and author of the four Sanskrit plays are identical.

In conclusion, I wish that some Kannada scholar would edit this *Ādipurāna*, and it is likely to prove a valuable addition to the early Kannada prose literature It is equally necessary that other works of Hastimalla should be brought to light so that his date and other details might be finally settled.

KAVI PARAMEŚVARA OR PARAMEṢṬHI*

In the history of Indian literature, there are many celebrated authors who are repeatedly remembered in subsequent works, but neither their works are available to-day, nor do we know any biographical details about them Kavi Parameśvara or Parameṣṭhi is one of them In this paper I propose to put together whatever bits of information have been available to me, especilly from Kannada and Sanskrit literature

Eminent Kannada poets like Ādi Pampa (c 941 A D), Abhinava Pampa (c 1100 A D), Nayasena (c 1112 A D) Aggaḷa (c 1189 A D.) and Kamalabhava (c 1235 A D) respectfully refer to Kavi Parameṣṭi along with Samantabhadra, the logician poet and Pūjyapāda, the grammarian [1] Ādi Pampa, it may be noted, calls him *jagat-prasiddha* Their verses are given below.

श्रीमत्समन्तभद्र-
स्वामिगळ जगत्प्रसिद्ध-कविपरमेष्ठि- ।
स्वामिगळ पूज्यपाद-
स्वामिगळ पदंगळीगे शाश्वतपदमं ॥

—Ādipurāna (Mysore 1900) I. 15

कविपरमेष्ठिगळ गुण
स्तवनंगळ पूज्यपादयतिय गुण- ।
स्तवनंगळ्वेमें नाल्गे-
गे बंद मानवन वाङ्मळं निंदपुदे ॥

—Rāmāyana I. 11

श्रीमत्समंतभद्र-
स्वामिगळ नेगळ्तेवेत्त-कविपरमेष्ठि- ।
स्वामिगळ पूज्यपाद-
स्वामिगळ पदंगळीगे बोधोदयमं ॥

—Dharmāmrta (Mysore 1924) I. 14

समनिके मन्मानसदोळ्
समंतभद्राघ्रिनखरकांतिजलं म- ।
समलिन कविपरमेष्ठि-
क्रमकमळं पूज्यपादपदनखकुसुमं ॥

—Candraprabha-purānam (Mysore 1901) I 20

* Published in the Proc and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference, 13th Session, pp 375-90, Nagpur 1946

[1] R. Narasimhacharya Karṇātaka-kavicarita, Vol I, (Bangalore 1924), pp. 2, 4-5,

भवहरसमंतभद्रर
कविपरमेष्ठिगळ पूज्यपादर कारु- ।
ण्यवरेण्य दुग्धवार्धियो-
ळविरतमिर्केम्म चित्तमत्तमराळं ॥

—Śāntiśvara-purānam (Mysore 1912) I 20

Then turning to individual references, Gunavarma II (c 1235 A D) tells us in his Puspadanta-purāna, I 26 (Madras 1933) that Kavi Paramesthi's mouth was beautiful with unparalleled speech, that he was praised by the learned, that he was almost the Parabrahman, and that he was no doubt a *purāna-purusa*

निरुपमसरस्वतीसुं-
दरचतुराननन शेषविबुधस्तुत्यं- ।
परमब्रह्मनेनल् कवि-
परमेष्ठि पुराणपुरुषनेंबुदु पुसिये ॥

Pārśvapandita (1205 A.D) qualifies him as '*guna-jyestha*' i e 'pre-eminent in virtues' in his Pārśvapurāna

निष्ठापरत्वदिं पर-
मेष्ठिस्तवनमनन्नूनमं माडि गुण- ।
ज्येष्ठनेनिसिप कविपर-
मेष्ठिगुणस्तवनमेमगे-दल करणीय ॥

Nemicandra (c 1170) tells us in his Neminathapurāna (I 15-16, Mysore, 1914) that Kavi Parameśvara wrote a *purāna* glorifying 24 Tirthankaras and that Brahman and Sarasvatī were waiting on his glory

जिनर पुराणगळोळो-
दने बरेदोडे बरेदुवेंबरीभुवनं जी-
यने वरेदिरिसिदरिप-
त्तुनाल्कमं पोगळ सुकविपरमेश्वररं ॥

सुकविपरमेष्ठिगळ ना-
टकवेनिसिद भुवनवंद्यवरविद्याती-
र्थकरत्वपुण्यलक्ष्मिगे
सकळभवदेषि यक्षि यक्ष बोम्मं ॥

Then, still earlier, Cāvuṇḍarāya (978 A D) in his Ādipurāṇa (Bangalore 1928) clearly tells us that Kavi Parameśvara wrote a Triṣaṣṭi-śalākā-purāna:

> चरितपुराणदोळ्वेवने
> वरेदर् बरेविक्किदर् त्रिषष्टिशलाका- ।
> पुरुषपुराणमं कवि-
> परमेश्वररंतु जसके नोंतरुमोळरे ॥

And in another context (p 6) he declares that the *mahā-purāna* was composed formerly by Kūci Bhaṭṭāraka and Śrīnandi Muni, and that his work, namely, the Kannada Cavundarāya Purāna only follows the compositions of Kavi Parameśvara, who is called *jināgama-tilaka*, Jinasena and Gunabhadra

> विरचिसिदर् मुन्ने महा-
> पुराणमं नेगळ्द् कूचिभट्टारकरु ।
> परम श्रीनंदिमुनी-
> श्वररं तदनतरं जिनागमतिळकर् ।
> कविपरमेश्वरर् बरेदुदं जिनसेनमहामुनीशरी-
> यवनिगे पेळ्दु माणे गुणभद्रमुनीश्वररेय्दे पेळ्दु प-
> ल्लविसिदुदं त्रिषष्टिपुरुषप्रतिबद्धपुराणमं महो-
> त्सवदोळे भव्यकोटिगरियल् बरेदं गुणरत्नभूषणं ॥

Gunabhadra,[2] at the end of his Uttarapurāna (middle of the 9th century A D) informs us that the Ādipurāna composed by his teacher Jinasena was based on the *gadya-kathā* of Kavi Parameśvara

> कविपरमेश्वर-निगदितगद्यकथामातृकं पुरोश्चरितम ।

Jinasena (c 837 A D) also respectfully mentions him as the compiler of the entire *purāna*, possibly under the title Vāgarthasamgraha

> स पूज्य. कविभिर्लोके कवीना परमेश्वर ।
> वागर्थसग्रहं कृत्स्नं पुराणं य समग्रहीत् ॥
>
> Adipurana I, 60

Besides these literary references, the Humch inscription of 1077 A D mentions Kavi Parameṣṭhi along with a host of Jaina teachers and authors [3]

Thus we see that Kavi Parameśvara is being respectfully mentioned by various authors from the beginning of the 9th century almost upto the middle of the 13th century A D His personality stands before us as that of a famous, worthy authoritative poet with

[2] About Jinesena, Gunabhadra etc , see, Premi Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa, pp 282, 497 ff , also Hiralal Dhavalā, Intro Amraoti 1939

[3] Epigraphia Carnatica VIII, Nagar No 35

remarkable mastery over expression He composed a *purāṇa* glorifying 63 Śalākā-puruṣas or celebrities of the Jaina church Gunabhadra says that it was a *gadya-kathā* and that it was used by Jinasena for his Ādipurāna Jinasena calls it Vāgartha-samgraha, and Cāmuṇḍarāya used it for his Kannada work It is a high compliment to the scholastic greatness of Kavi Paramesthi that he is ranked with Samantabhadra and Pūjyapāda whose works have come down to us

This is all that we glean about Kavi Parameśvara's personality from the casual references of subsequent authors, some of whom had actually used his work His date is uncertain [4] But he definitely flourished earlier than Jinasena who finished his Jayadhavalā in 837 A.D.

As yet we have not been able to trace the work of Kavi Parameśvara in any Ms library, but the chances of tracing it are not remote, because many collections in the South are not fully explored

Lately, the section of Śāntipurāna from the Cāmundarāyapurāna has been published,[5] and we are lucky to find there that Cāmundarāya has given some quotations attributed to Kavi Parameśvara I reproduce below the extracts almost as they are

कविपरमेश्वरर वृत्त ।

रामत्वं गणभृत्वमप्यभिमतं लोकान्तिकत्वं तथा
षट्खण्डप्रभुता सुखानुभवनं सर्वार्थसिद्ध्यादिषु ।
इंद्रत्वं महिमादिभिश्च सहितं न प्राप्तं ससारिभि:
तत्प्राप्तो भवहेतुसंसृतिलताच्छेदे कुतः संयम. ॥

कविपरमेश्वरर श्लोक ।

कषायोद्रेककालुष्यं व्रतदर्शनसत्तप. ।
दूषयत्यचिराद्राजन ततः क्रोधादि वर्जयेत् ॥

त्यागेन लोभं क्षमया प्रकोपं
मानं मृदुत्वेन मनोहरेण ।
धृत्तेन मायामृजुनाभिवृद्धिं
नरेंद्र हन्यात्परलोककांक्षी ।
स्थूलेषु दयां प्राणिषु करोति सूक्ष्मेषु विलसदनुकम्पाम् ।
आरम्भाहतकर्मसु गृहाश्रमो निष्प्रतिज्ञानः ॥

चरणादवनाळदमया विषया नानादपि प्रजासुवदा ।
तदवनये वर्षितां न चिरं ससारभाङ् नृपती ॥ [?][6]

[4] R Narasimhacharya would like to put Kavi Parameśvara between Samantabhadra and Pūjyapāda, and he gives to him a tentative date, viz, 550 A D This is just a conjecture, and the earlier limit of his date is not at all fixed We want more evidence

[5] Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā, Vol 29, March-June 1944, pp 53, 58

[6] This verse is apparently corrupt and obscure

हिंसातः प्राणिनोऽन्यायाद्राजन्दण्डेन वारयन् ।
संचिनोति व्रती पुण्यमहिंसाया समार्जितम् ॥
अल्पानल्पापराधेषु तद्योग्यानपि दण्डयन् ।
खचरेन्द्रमहापुण्य समाधत्ते नृप' कृती ॥

गुंदहिंसाव्रतमनरिपि

तत्सुसाधुवच सत्यं प्राणिपीडापराङ्मुखम् ।
येन सावद्यकर्माणि न स्पृशन्ति भयादिव ॥
नाग्निर्दहत्युच्चशिखाकलापस्तीव्रं विषं निर्विषतामुपैति ।
शस्त्रं शतद्योतविभूषणत्वं सत्येन किं ते न भवेदभीष्टम् ॥

गुंद सत्यव्रतमनरिपि

परस्वार्जनमन्यायं प्रकाशस्तेनमुच्यते ।
नृपते चोरयंल्लोके वञ्चकस्तेन सस्मृत. ॥
इह जन्मनि तद्राजन् व्यक्तमख्यातिवर्धनम् ।
विचित्रदुःखसंपादि परत्र च विशेषतः ॥
अधर्मसंग्रहोऽन्यायान्नृपस्यान्यस्वसग्रह
प्रजाविद्वेषणीयश्च जायते येन कर्मणा ॥

गुंदस्तेयव्रतमनरिपि

परदारपरावृत्तो वर्तते यः क्षितीश्वर' ।
समग्विहितकरकमलमुकुलैर्देवैरपि स प्रणमनीय. ॥ [?][7]
स्वदारगतम्येत्य मात्रयानुभवन्नृपः ।
भवेद् स्वार्थपरः कामं जनानां चापदेशक' ॥

We are not in a position to state whether only the opening verse of the larger extract belongs to Kavi Paramesthi or all the verses are to be attributed to him All the quotations are in Sanskrit and in a metrical form One verse is very obscure and one line metrically defective Cāmundarāya says that he has used Kavi Parameśvara's work, it is very good of him that he quotes by mentioning the author's name.

Kavi Parameśvara's work, as the quotations indicate, was in Sanskrit and in verses. There is one difficulty in accepting this that Gunabhadra has described Kavi Parameśvara's work as *gadya-kathā* Possibly it was in prose with some verses here and there, and for convenience Cāmundarāya might have quoted only the verses

If not the whole work of Kavi Parameśvara, at least a couple of quotations are available to us And I do hope, some day, like the Varāṅgacarita of Jātila, Kavi Parameśvara's *purāna* would be discovered

[7] Metrically defective

CĀMUNDARĀYA AND HIS LITERARY PREDECESSORS*

Cāmundarāya is one of those celebrated personalities of medieval India who have enriched the cultural heritage of India. He was a great warrior, an eminent author and an ardent religious devotee, but what has made his name memorable in the annals of our land is his construction of the colossus of Bāhubali on the hillock at Śravana Belgola. The image is 57 feet in height, daring in conception, gigantic in dimensions and exquisite in workmanship. The expression is symbolic of religious detachment and poise, and the serene face of the statue facing north breathes a message of peace.[1]

Cāmundarāya gives some meagre information about himself in his *Trişaşţi-lakşana-mahāpurāna* (TLM), popularly known as *Cāmundarāya-Purānam* (CP).[2] He was born in a Brahmaksatriya family, his master (i.e., the king under whom he served as minister-general) was Nonamba-kulāntakadeva (i.e., Mārasimha, A.D. 964-974) of the Ganga dynasty, so also his successor Rācamalla (IV), and his preceptor was Ajitasena Bhattāraka. He earned renown for his valour, causing wonder to many by exhibiting the might of his arms in piercing Rājāyta (i.e., Rājāditya) at close quarters, for bravery in smashing Rāca, dexterity in giving hot chase to Govindaras, and heroism in slaying in battle the feudatory chief Rācaya of superior strength. Like terrified rabbits seeking shelter, his enemies entertain perpetual fear whenever he, Anna makes a move, marches out or launches an attack. Like the sound of the Dīpāvali drum, the hostile potentates rush into every household in fright, entreating: 'The unsurpassed warrior is in a rage, give us shelter, protect us'.[3]

Cāmundarāya possessed a number of titles the origin of which is thus related: 'From his defeat of Vajvaladeva in the Khedaga† war he obtained the title Samara-dhurandhara, from the valour he displayed in the plain of Gonūru in the Nolamba war (against Jagadeka-vīra?), the title Vīra-mārtānda, from his brave fight against Rājāditya in the fort of Uccangi, the title Ranaranga-singa, from his killing Tribhuvanavīra in the fort of Bāgevūra (or Bāyilūra) and enabling Govindara to enter it, the title Vairikula-kāladanda, from his defeat of Rāja, Bāsa, Sivara, Kūnāmka and other warriors in the fort of king Kāma the title Bhuja-Vikrama, from his slaying Mudurācaya known as Caladanka-Ganga and Ganga-rabhata who killed his younger brother Nāgavarma, the title Samara-Paraśurāma, from his subjugation of the tribal chief, the title Pratipaksa-Rāksasa, from his killing many warriors, the title Bhata-māri and in view of his religious and moral virtues, the titles

* Published in the *Journal of the Karnatak University*, Vol IV, No 2, June 1960

[1] *Epigraphia Carnatica* (E.C.), II, Bangalore, 1923, Intro., pp. 10 ff

[2] *Ādipurānam*, Bangalore, 1928, Intro. and introductory verses, also E.C., II, Intro., pp. 45 f. and Inscription No. 281. A complete edition of this work is in press to be published by the Jaina-Sāhitya-pracārasamgha, Mysore

[3] *C.P.*, Intro. verses 21-23 with the preceding prose. Thanks to Shri P. B. Desai and Shri B. S. Kulkarni, Dharwar, for their suggestions on these verses

† Manne khedaga (= Mānyakhēta) MCP's—Ed

Guṇa-kāva, Samyaktva-ratnākara, Śaucābharana, Satya-Yudhisthira, and Subhaṭa-cūḍāmani.[4]

Cāmundarāya was known also by the names Gŏmmata (perhaps of domestic use), Gŏmmata-Rāya, Rāya or Anna [5] It is after him that Bāhubali's colossus came to be called Gŏmmaṭeśvara Besides this statue on the Vindhyagiri, he also erected there a pillar, the Tyāgada Brahmadeva Pillar, on which we have a partly effaced Praśasti of Cāmundarāya, and a temple, called Cāmuṇḍarāya-basadi, on the Candragiri It appears that he had a son, Jinadevana, who erected a temple of Jina at Belgola [6]

Cāmundarāya refers to some eminent saints and authors and also quotes some Prākrit and Sanskrit verses in his TLM completed in Śaka 900, i e , A D 978 The object of this paper is to shed some light on his literary predecessors [7]

1 Grdhrapiñchhācārya (G) He wrote the *Tattvarthasūtra* which became famous everywhere, achieved all-round renown and spread or established the greatness of the doctrine of Jina (verse 3)

Notes G was another name of Umāsvāti[8], possibly from his keeping a bunch of vulture-feathers as distinguished from other monachs who used bunches of peacock feathers, etc [9] A good deal has been written on him and his works

2 Siddhasenācārya (S) He rose to eminence by his poetic skill in the congregation of great poets (and) after composing the hymns (or the Sanmati) with his special genius, and thus won the praise of all (verse 4)

Notes S is known as a great logician and a gifted poet There were many authors of this name, and hence the authorship of some works has been a point of dispute There is not much doubt that Cāmundarāya is referring to the poet S , the author of different *Stutis* The reading *sannutiyim* is not satisfactory perhaps it is *sanmutiyam* referring to

[4] Abhayacandra in his Sanskrit commentary on the Gommaṭasāra mentions him as the Mahāmātya of Rācamalla of the Ganga dynasty and gives his titles Raṇaraṅgamalla, Asahāya-parākrama, Gunaratna-bhūṣaṇa, Samyaktvaratna-nilava, etc Some of these are used as adjectives of Mahāvira, by sleṣa, in the Gommaṭasāra

[5] R Narasimhacarya *Karnāṭaka Kavicarite I*, Bangalore 1924 A N Upadhye *Gommaṭa*, *Bhāratīya Vidyā II*, i pp 48-58, Materials for the interpretation of the term Gommata *Indian Historical Quarterly XVI* pp 819-826 Nathurāma Premi *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa* (Bombay 1956) pp 266 f

[6] *E C , II*, No 121 (R N Ed)

[7] A Sanskrit work *Cāritrasāra* (Mānikacanda D J Granthamālā, No 9, Bombay 1917), is attributed to Cāmuṇḍarāva The colophon mentions Cāmundarāya, the favourite of Ajitasena, as the author, and the concluding verse specifies his title Raṇaranga-simha Shri V B Lokapur has raised a question (Prabuddha-Karnāṭaka 1953) whether Ranna might have composed the CP and attributed it to his patron, because there are common or nearly common passages in the CP (A D 978) and Ajitapurāna (A D 993) The positive documentary evidence stands without any doubt, and that Ranna Nāgavarma and Brahmaśiva do not refer to Cāmundarāya as a poet proves nothing The available evidence, therefore, only admits B M Shrikanthayya's suggestion that Ranna's revisionist's hand might be suspected in the CP

[8] *E C* , II, No 254, see also Nos 64, 66, 117 (R N Ed)

[9] For details about him the following important sources may be consulted J Mukthar *Svāmi Samantabhadra* (Bombay 1925), pp 144 f, Sukhalal Sanghavi *Tattvārtha-sūtra* with Vivecana in Hindi (Banaras 1939), N Premi *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa* (Bombay 1956), pp 521 ff

his composition of *Stutis* If the reading was *Sannatiyaṃ*, which, in my opinion, is more probable and gives a better sense to the verse, it is obviously a reference to the great logical treatise, *Sanmatitarka* In that case, according to Cāmundarāya, S was the author of the *Sanmati* as well as a gifted poet who is assigned to the 5th century A.D.[10]

3 Samantabhadra-deva None can equal S-deva who attained all-round fame by the glory of exposition, after composing the famous Tattvārtha-bhāsya (and) a treatise on logic (Tarka-śāstra) Poets held in high estimation these three, G , S , and S-deva, as three jewels (*ratnatraya*—verses 5-6)

Notes Cāmundarāya clearly attributes a *bhāsya* on the Tattvārtha to S-Deva, so also a treatise on logic There are some other authors who also attribute a *bhāṣya* to him like this, and in some places it is called Gandhahasti and its extent is given as 96 thousand verses Gunavarma (*c* 1230 A D) in his Kannaḍa Puspadantapurāna (I 22), Hastimalla (*c* A D 9th to 13th century) in his Vikrāntakaurava, Dharmabhūsana in his Nyāyadīpikā (1385 A D), and Laghu Samantabhadra in his Ṭippanī on the Astasahasrī But this work has not come to light as yet A good deal of information about S-Deva has been made available by researches during the last few years [11]

4. Pūjyapāda-Bhaṭṭāraka He is praised by all as a worthy poet, an author of a grammar, one capable of moving in the sky and an eminent logician (verse 7, not found in all the MSS) [12]

5 Kavi-Parameśvara He attained unequalled fame by composing the unique Trisasti-śalākā-purusa-purāna (verses 8—not found in all the MSS , also 25)

Notes Though his work has not come down to us, he is one of the earliest authors who wrote the biography of Śalākāpurusas Many Sanskrit and Kannada authors, as I have shown elsewhere,[13] have referred to him in complimentary terms from the 9th century almost up to the middle of the 13th century A D He is also mentioned as Kavi Paramesthi 'His personality stands before us as that of a famous, worthy, authoritative poet with remarkable mastery over expression He composed a Purāna glorifying 63 Śalākā-purusas or celebrities of the Jaina Church Gunabhadra says that it was a *gadya-kathā* and it was used by Jinasena for his Ādipurāna Jinasena calls it Vāgartha-samgraha, and Cāmundarāya used it for his Kannada work It is a high compliment to the scholastic greatness of Kavi Parameṣṭhi that he is ranked with Samantabhadra and Pūjyapada whose works have come down to us In the section of the Śāntipurāna[14], Cāmundarāya quotes a few verses of Kavi Parameśvara The work was in Sanskrit, and perhaps a Campū in form

[10] Sukhalal Sanghavi and B Doshi *Sanmati Prakarana* (in Gujarāti), Punjābhāi-Jaina-Granthamālā-5, Ahmedabad 1932, an English version of this has also appeared, Sanmati Tarka, Bombay 1939, J Mukthar Purātana-Jainavākya-sūcī, Vīrasevāmandira-Granthamālā-5, Sarasawa 1950, pp 119-168

[11] J Mukthar *Svāmi Samantabhadra*, Bombay 1925, Samicina-dharmaśāstra, Intro , Delhi 1955

[12] Nathuram Premi *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa* (Bombay 1956) pp 22 f Phoolachandra Shastri *Sarvārthasiddhi* (Banares 1955) pp 84 ff of the Intro

[13] Vide my paper ' Kavi Parameśvara or Parameṣṭhi ', *Proceedings etc , All-India Oriental Conference*, Nagpur 1946, pp 375 ff, cf previous article

[14] *Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrike*, Bangalore, 29, March-June 1944, pp 53, 58

6-7. Vīrasena-Bhaṭṭāraka and Jinasena-Ācārya. Both of these, on account of their prominence in Jainism and self-control, were great saints, veritable Jinas among other monks Their fame was established all round on account of their works dealing with Siddhānta, Mahāpurāna, Naya-śāstra, poetry and drama (verses-9, 10, not found in all the MSS., also 25)

Notes Researches during the last thirty years have brought many facts about these authors to light These two, along with Gunabhadra, formed a composite literary personality, as it were. Vīrasena was a pupil of Āryanandi and a grand-pupil of Candrasena and belonged to Pañcastūpānvaya,[15] which later on was superseded by Senānvaya. He inherited the knowledge of the Siddhānta from Elācārya His available works are Dhavalā Ṭīkā (on the major parts of the Saṭkhandāgama)[16] in 72 thousand verses (completed in A D 816) and Jayadhavalā-ṭīkā (on the Kaṣāyaprābhrta) left incomplete after writing 20 thousand verses and then completed by Jinasena by adding 40 thousand verses, in A D. 837 These works are known by the name Siddhānta Jinasena had a great disciple in the Rāstrakūta king, Amoghavarṣa He has to his credit two other works, the Pārśvābhyudaya, a Samasyāpurāna of the Meghadūta of Kālidāsa, and the Mahāpurāna, left incomplete by him but later completed by Gunabhadra, some time before A D 898.[17]

8 Gunabhadra-deva He was a Traividya, and (almost) a Ganadhara His precepts and practice were mutually consistent He was brought up and trained along with Sarasvatī and Brahman On account of his great learning, he was considered as a veritable Divine by common people He was held in great respect and reverence by all the monks (verses 11-13, also 25)

Notes Besides completing the Mahāpurāna of his teacher Jinasena, Gunabhadra has composed the Ātmānuśāsana, a didactic anthology in Sanskrit.[18]

9 Dharmasenācārya He belonged to Candrikāvāta-vamśa, and he was learned and of spotless fame and character (verse 14)

Notes A MS of CP in my possession also reads *vamśa* (for *vāsa*) which is a synonym for *anvaya*. In one of the Paṭṭāvalis[19], brought to light by A F.R. Hoernle, there is a reference to Candrakapāṭa-gaccha associated with Kānūra-gana and Simha-samgha Like Hanasoge-anvaya, deriving its name from a place Hanasoge, it is quite possible that Candrikāvāṭa (with some variation in spelling) is the name of a place. Shri Desai has suggested that it may be identical with the present-day village Chāndakavaṭe in the Sindgi Taluk of the Bijapur Dt In an inscription from Mulgunda, it is noticed that, a gift was entrusted into the hands of a preceptor Kanakasena-sūri, disciple of Vīrasena, who in turn

[15] A N Upadhye '*Pañcastūpānvaya*' Karṇāṭaka Historical Review, VII, 1-2

[16] The edition of Dhavalā is published in 16 volumes by the Śrīmanta Setha Laksmīchandra Sitābarāya Jaina-Sāhityadhāraka-Fund, Amraoti-Vidisha, 1939-58, and so far 7 vols of Java-dhavalā are out from Mathura

[17] On these two authors see H L Jain *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, Vol 1 (Amraoti 1939), Intro., and Nathuram Premi *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa* (Bombay 1956), pp 127 ff

[18] On Guṇabhadra see N Premi *Jaina Sāhitva aur Itihāsa*, pp 138 ff and also the Intro to Mahāpurāṇa Vols 1-2, Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Banaras 1951-54

[19] *Indian Antiquary*, XXI, March 1892, pp 57 f, pp especially 69 and 73

was the senior pupil (*maukha*) of Kumārasena belonging to the Sena-anvaya of Candrikāvāṭa' It is highly probable that Kumārasena mentioned in the next verse is the same as the one mentioned in the Mulgunda record, and he too belonged to Candrikāvātavamśa to which Dharmasena belonged Shri Desai has tried to work out a continuous genealogy from Dharmasena to (Nayasena II, through) Ajitasena, referred to in our verses Nos. 14-18 [20]

10. Kumārasena He practised severe vows and, after accepting renunciation at Mulgunda (Dt Dharwar), retired to Kopanādri (mod Kopbal, S.Rly) where he breathed his last according to scriptural prescriptions (of the Samādhi-marana) and attained liberation, it was all unique on his part (verse 15)

11-13 Nāgasena, Vīrasena and Candrasena[21] They practised severe penance and enhanced the glory of the Jaina doctrine (verse 16)

Notes This Vīrasena, the pupil of Kumārasena, of the Candrikāvāta-senānvaya, is mentioned in the Mulgunda inscription[22]. One Candrasena is mentioned in one of the inscriptions at Kopbal,[23] but there is no evidence, besides similarity of name, to say that he was identical with the Candrasena mentioned here

14 Āryanandi or Āryasena He was a great monk, quiet, pure, learned, austere and of exemplary conduct, and did good to his pupils he was a moving embodiment of holiness (verse 17)

Notes A MS of CP in my possession reads Āryasena for Āryanandi

15 Ajitasenācārya He was respected by kings and was a pupil of Āryasena In matters of religious enlightenment and guidance, he deserves to be respected Anna or Cāmundarāya (who was *priya-darśana*, which reminds one of Asoka's title, and *dharma-priya*) was his disciple (verses 19-20)

Notes Elsewhere Āryasena is mentioned as the *guru* of Ajitasena who, in turn a World-Teacher (*bhuvana-guru*), is the guru of Gommata or Cāmundarāya[24] So, in this verse, the reading of Kha should be accepted So both the name Āryanandi and Āryasena refer to one and the same Ācārya, the guru of Ajitasena Ajitasena was a renowned teacher of his age He was the preceptor of the Ganga rulers Mārasimha and Rācamalla and of the minister-general Cāmuṇḍarāya According to a Śravana Belgola inscription[25], Mārasimha

[20] P B Desai *Jainism in South India and Some Jaina Epigraphs* (Sholapur, 1957), pp 134-139 also his paper in Kannaḍa ' Candrikāvātada Yatigaḷu ' in the *Kannada Sāhitya Pariṣat-patrike* for 1951, pp 41-60

[21] It is interesting to note that Vīrasena (noted in verses 6-7) calls himself the grand-pupil of Candrasena and the pupil of Āryanandi, possibly they may be different authors

[22] J F Fleet *Journal of B B R A S X*, 167-69, *Epigraphia India*, XIII, 190 f also Shri Desai's paper noted above

[23] The Kannaḍa Inscriptions of Kopbāḷ, Hyderabad 1935

[24] See Gommaṭasāra, Jīvakāṇḍa, gāthā 733, Bombay 1916 also my paper ' Materials for the Interpretation of the term Gommaṭa *I H Q* Vol XVI, No 2, 1940, pp 819 f cf previous article

[25] *E.C* II, (R N Ed) No 59 (39)

relinquished the sovereignty, and keeping the vow of *sallekhanā* for three days in the presence of Ajitasena-bhattāraka, died at Bankāpura (Dt Dharwar) in A D 974 Jinadevana, son of Cāmundarāya, was also a lay disciple of Ajitasena, he erected a Jina temple at Belgoḷa in 995 A D [26] In an inscription of A D 1053 at Mulgunda, Ajitasena-bhattāraka is called Candrakavātānvya-varisthar[27] and further associated with Senānvaya and Mulasaṅgha, the Sanskrit verse mentioning these two items is identical with one (No 1) of the Praśasti verses of the Uttarapurāna completed by Gunabhadra, some time before A D 898 It is shown elsewhere that Senānvaya superseded Pañcastūpānvaya[28], and here is an indication that it is absorbing the Candrakavatānvaya too If this surmise is correct, the credit must go to two great teachers, Jinasena and Gunabhadra

16 Kūci-bhattāraka He was the author of a Mahāpurāna (verse 24)

17 Śrīnandi He was a great monk and perhaps wrote on the subject of the Mahāpurāna

Notes One feels like taking verses 24 and 25 together, in that case, *Jināgama-tilakar* is an adjective of the Kavi-Parameśvara Kūci-bhattāraka is not known from any other source, and the name of an author it sounds a little obscure It may be that it stands as an adjective of Śrinandi who, in that case, might have been a Bhattāraka, a renowned teacher of the Kūrcaka section, which is mentioned along with Nirgrantha and Yāpanīya in the Kadamba copper plates [29]

In the concluding portion of CP, while recounting the inheritance of scriptural knowledge from Mahāvīra onwards through Kevalins, etc , the following dignitaries with their works are mentioned, and they deserve to be noticed [30]

18-19 Bhūtabali and Puspadanta They composed the Sūtras of Satkhanda

Notes 'The teachings of Lord Mahāvīra were arranged into Twelve Angas by his pupil Indrabhūti Gautama, and they were handed down from preceptor to pupil by word of mouth till gradually they fell into oblivion Only fractions of them were known to Dharasena who practised penance in the Candra Guphā of Girinagara in the country of Saurāstra (Mod Kathiawar) He felt the necessity of preserving the knowledge and so he called two sages, who afterwards became famous as Puspadanta and Bhūtabali, and taught to them portions of the fifth Anga, Viāhapannatti and of the twelfth Anga, Ditthivāda These were subsequently reduced to writing in Sūtra form by the two eminent pupils Puspadanta composed the first 177 Sūtras, which are all embodied in the present edition of Satprarūpanā , and his colleague Bhūtabali wrote the rest, the total being 6000 Sūtras[31]

[26] *E C* II (R N Ed), No 121 (67)

[27] *E I* , XVI, pp 53 ff , and the Kannada paper of Shri Desai noted above

[28] See the remarks of Vīrasena above

[29] *Indian Antiquary* VI, pp 25-27, 30 31, Pt Premi suggests that Kūrcaka monks might be those who grew beard and mustache See Jaina Sāhitya aura Itihāsa (Bombay 1956), pp 559 f

[30] I am thankful to Shri M C Padmanabha Sharma, Mysore, who kindly sent to me some concluding portion of CP, duly copied from the Ms

[31] Ṣaṭkhandāgama I, (Amraoti 1939), Intro p i

They are to be assigned to the beginning of the Christian era Dhavalā of Vīrasena is a commentary on these Sūtras

20. Gunadhara He is the author of the Kasāyaprābhṛtasūtra (KPS) and is called Jina-mata-tilaka

Notes Gunadhara was more or less a contemporary of Dharasena, and his Sūtras are explained in the Jayadhavalā of Vīrasena-Jinasena, as noted above

21-23. Nāgahasti, Yati-Vrsabha and Uccāranācārya These were Kārana-purusas, i e, outstanding personalities [32]

Notes We know from other sources that Nāgahasti and Āryamanksu (elsewhere Ayyamangu) were the first to receive from Gunadhara the explanation of the Sūtras of KPS. Yati-Vṛṣabha studied from them KPS and wrote the Cūrnisūtra on them, and on this Uccāranācārya wrote the Uccārana-sūtra These are found incorporated in the Jayadhavalā [33] Yati-Vṛṣabha is also the author of Tiloyapannatti which has lately been edited by me in collaboration with Dr H L Jain [34]

After these the CP gives the succession list as follows

24 Māghanandi, possibly the same as one mentioned in the Śrutāvatāra 102

25 Śyāmakunda, who was an expert in many Āgamas

Notes According to the Śrutāvatara, he studied both the Āgamas, Satkhanda and KP, and wrote a commentary called Paddhati in Sanskrit, Prākrit and Kannada on their major portion

26. Tembūlūrācārya Elsewhere, his name is spelt Tumbū The CP simply gives the names of these authors, but some details about them are found in the Srutāvatāra and also scrutinised lately [35]

Notes He wrote in Kannada a commentary Cūdāmani on the first five Khandas and a Pañcikā on the Sixth Khanda, the total reaching some ninetyone thousand verses

27 Samantabhadra See No 3 above According to the Śrutāvatāra, he was a Tārkikārka, and he too is said to have written a Tīkā on the Āgamas

28-30 Śubhanandi, Ravinandi and Bappadeva

Notes Bappadeva studied the Siddhānta from Śubhanandi and Ravinandi and wrote a commentary (on the five Khandas) Vyākhyā-prajñapti by name in Prākrit His place of activity, according to the Śrutāvatāra, lies in North Karnātaka His opinions are referred to in the Jayadhavalā

31 Elācārya CP merely mentions the name

[32] On these various authors see Śrutāvatāra of Indranandi (Bombay 1918) verses 151 f

[33] *Kasāyapāhuḍa*, Vol I, Intro, pp 9 f Mathura 1944

[34] *Jīvarāja J Granthamālā*, Sholapur, Vol I, 1943, Vol II, 1951

[35] *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍagama*, Intro pp 48 ff

Notes· As noted above, Vīrasena, according to his own Praśasti, inherited Siddhānta from Elācārya, who, as stated in the Śrutāvatāra, was a resident of Citrakūṭa

32-33 Vīrasena and Jinasena See Nos 6-7 above

Notes Cāmundarāya paid his respects to them, at the beginning of his work, because they were great Ācāryas, and his own work was very much indebted to Jinasena's work Here they are again mentioned because of the great part played by them in the continuation of Āgama study

34 Ajitasena See No 15 above He belonged to the Saṃtati of the teachers mentioned above, and Cāmundarāya was his pupil (*gudda*)

Below is given an alphabetical Index of the Prākrit and Sanskrit verses found quoted in the published portion of CP, along with their sources noted by me wherever possible The ordinary and starred numbers in the first column refer to the pages of the ed of CP (2nd ed Bangalore 1928) and of the Kannada SP Patrike vol 29, 1-2, in which Śāntipurāna is printed) respectively The sources noted by me are put in square brackets

Page No	*Verse*	*Author and Work*
*59	अधर्मसम्प्रह्रोऽन्यायात्	
*59	अल्पानल्पापराधेषु	
47	अवलम्बमानमणि	
45	अहमिन्द्रसौख्यमनुभूय	
*59	इह जन्मनि तद्राजन्	
47	कनकाद्रिनीलधन	
*58	कषायोद्रेककालुष्यं	कविपरमेश्वर
*59	कुर्वन्पर्वोपवास	
46	गजमस्तकासृगरुणीकृत	
*59	चरणाद्वनाद्मया	
47	चलदुन्मदालिधृत	
*59	तत्साधुवच: सत्यं	
47	तेनापि तटफलमनुत्तरम्	
58	त्यागेन क्षेमं क्षमया	
46	दलिताम्बुजातमपनीत	
40	दसु हेट्ठिमासु पुढविसु	
42	दंसणवदसामाइय	[कुन्दकुन्द—द्वादशानुप्रेक्षा ६९]
*46	दिविजेन्द्रचापरुचि	
73	दिव्या पुरी रत्नमतो	
47	दृष्ट्वा जिनेन्द्रजननी	
99	धर्मार्थकाममोक्षा:	

Page No.	*Verse*	*Author and Work*
*59	नाभिर्दहत्युच्चशिखाकलाप	
68	निःशेषत्रिदशेन्द्रशेखर	[भूपाल—जिनचतुर्विंशतिका ४]
56	पडिगहमुच्चट्ठाणं	[वसुनन्दि—श्रावकाचार २२५]
*59	परदारपरावृत्तो	
*59	परस्वार्जनमन्याय	
47	पवनोच्चलद्विपुल	
68	प्रज्ञापारमित स	[भूपाल—जिनचतुर्विंशतिका ७]
48	मनोजमातङ्गमतङ्ग	
8	मृत्सारिणी महिष	[जटासिंहनन्दि—वराङ्गचरित १-१५]
68	राज्य शासनकारि	[भूपाल—जिनचतुर्विंशतिका ५]
*53	रामत्वं गणधृत्वमभ्यभि	कविपरमेश्वर
45	विगलत्कपोलमद	
*59	विश्व प्रार्थयते	पूर्वाचार्य
56	श्रद्धाशक्तिरलुब्धत्वं	
62	श्रेणीद्वयाधिपत्येन	[गुणभद्र—उत्तरपुराण पृ १६५]
*58	स्थूलेषु दया प्राणिषु	
*59	स्वदारगतमभ्येत्य	
67	स्वामिन्नद्य विनिर्गतोऽस्मि	[भूपाल—जिनचतुर्विंशतिका ३]
*58	हिंसातः प्राणिनो	

A study of the sources of the verses quoted by Cāmuṇḍarāya will be more significant when the entire text of CP is published and when all the quotations are traced to their sources The study undertaken here is of limited value Among the authors quoted, Kundakunda is a well-known figure in Jaina literary history, and some of his works have come down to us [36] Some observations on Kavi-Parameśvara are already added under No 5 above Jaṭā-Siṃhanandi is an equally famous author, and his Varāṅgacarita has already seen the light of day [37] It is this reference of Cāmuṇḍarāya that enabled the present writer to bring to light so many details about Siṃhanandi and to establish his identity with the author of an anonymous Varāṅgacarita The so-called quotation from the Śrāvakācāra of Vasunandi is not fully identical in readings and it may present some chronological difficulties It is not unlikely that it is an older verse adapted by Vasunandi himself This point should await further investigation We know very little about Bhūpāla and his age [38] all that we can now say is that he is earlier than Cāmuṇḍarāya About Guṇabhadra we have noted the necessary information under No 8 above

[36] Vide my Intro to the ed , of Pravacanasāra, Bombay 1935

[37] See my Intro to the *Varāṅgacarita* of Jaṭā Siṃhanandi, Bombay 1938 cf article No 3, in this Compendium

[38] *Kāvyamālā* VII, N S Press, Bombay 1926

A PATTĀVALI OF THE SENAGAṆA*

A copy of the Pattāvali, which is being published here, I got some seventeen years back from Pt Bahubali Sharma, Sangli, and all these years I tried to get another Ms of it with the help of which a more authentic text could be presented In the meanwhile I gave extracts etc , from it to some scholars now and then As yet I have not come across any other Ms , perhaps the publication of this tentative text itself may attract the attention of some scholars and some Mss may be brought to light by them I have made here and there only minor corrections which do not affect the contents The text is obscure in many places, and linguistic and metrical defects are quite obvious A better text can be constituted only after some more Mss come to light There are important traditions embedded in this Pattāvali which deserve our attention, and we must see whether any of these get confirmed by other independent sources Thus in this paper, I am presenting not only the tentative text and Name Index but also a few observations on some important items of information mentioned in this Pattāvali

The first nine verses give the account of Teachers beginning with Tīrthakaras and ending with Ācārāngadhārins The tenth verse tells us that this is a Pattāvali of the Mūlasaṁgha, Sena-gaṇa, Puṣkara-gaccha Jinasena, who is said to have succeeded Vṛddha Kumārasena, is credited with the compilation of three crores of texts, and he is called a Poet-creator who expounded Dhavala, Mahādhavala, Jayadhavala and Vijayadhavala [1] Dharasena and Vīrasena came after him, they studied Siddhānta under Elācārya, Vīrasena is associated with a place Vāṭa, and these two, with Jayasena (?), further laborated Jayadhavala (12-15)

Siddhasena Divākara is said to have enlightened Vikramāditya at Ujjayani, perhaps by producing an image of Pārśva from a Linga which was broken (16) Samantabhadra succeeded Siddhasena, and produced an image of Candraprabha out of the Bhimalinga at Drākṣābhirāma in the Telugu country (17)

Vīrasena propitiated the Siddhacakra in the Hemnāgumphā on the Raivata, and his successor Jinasena composed the Purāṇa (*vimala-pada-yutam*), he had a guru-bandhu in Daśaratha and his pupil was Guṇabhadra (21-22)

Later another Vīrasena is mentioned as the author of the Padmacaritra (26) Devasena, the successor of Vimalasena, composed five Sāras (27) [2] Mahāsena, the teacher of the King of Sindhu, composed the Pradyumnakāvya (29) [3] One Brahmasena is associated with Ālanda (32) Mallisena composed various Mantragranthas such as Padmāvatīkalpa etc (35) Kamalabhadra prescribed Vows or Vratas to Āsādhara (38) Kumārasena (?)

* Published in the Jaina Antiquary, Vol XIII, No 11, Arrah 1948

[1] Compare this with what we definitely know from the Dhavalā etc , Intro Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama, pp 35f Amraoti 1939

[2] We know his Ārādhanā-sāra, Tattva-sāra and Darsana-sāra

[3] Compare the colophon of the Pradyumnacarita

श्रीसिन्धुराजसत्कमहामहत्तम-श्रीपप्पटगुरो महासेनाचार्यकृते प्रद्युम्नचरिते etc , Bombay 1916.

pacified the pain of arrows of king Allādikhan, possibly he rescued some people from the jail and is associated with Allāvuddin (39) Śrīdhara held a dispute with Buddhists for months together at Śrikañcī (40) It appears that Somasena held a dispute with Sīvas-āmi of Stambha-tīrtha, and Mahamūda Pātasāha was his pupil (41) Śrutavīra went from Aṅkuleśvara to Bharvasya and got the Jajiyā tax removed The last monk of the line mentioned in this Pattāvali, is Lakshmīsena

The text being corrupt, I cannot be sure of the meaning of some passages The Pattāvali, however, notes a few events from traditional memory, and they should be accepted as such and verified with the aid of tother sources'[1]

[पट्टावलिः]

श्रीमन्मारजितो जयन्ति विभवस्तीर्थंकरा स्वामिनो
वीरान्ता वृषभारिका: परिलसत्प्राणिघृणातत्परा ।
येषां संस्मृरणाविसेवनतया पापं विनाशं व्रजेत्
पुण्यंचोल्लसतीह बन्धनशतान्मुक्ति ध्रवं जायते ॥ १ ॥

श्रीमन्तो विभवार्णवा· समभवन् शिष्या गणेशोत्तमा-
स्तेषां नेत्रशरोदधीन्दुसुमितास्तेभ्योऽभवन् सत्तमाः ।
रम्याः केवलिनोऽथ गौतमविभु सम्यक्सुधर्माख्यको
जम्बूस्वाम्यथ कर्मनिर्जरतया तेषां भव दूरग ॥ २ ॥

श्रतकेवलिन पञ्च श्रीविष्णुर्नन्दिमित्रक. ।
सञ्ज्ञोऽपराजितश्चेति धर्मी गोवर्धनो भवेत् ॥ ३ ॥

भद्रबाहुरिति स्यातो व्रतीं तपसि सुस्थित
क्षमायां सुधिया रभ्पो महाव्रतपरायण· ॥ ४ ॥

विशाखप्रोष्टिलौ प्रोक्तौ नक्षत्रजयसाह्वय· ।
नागसेनश्च सिद्धार्थो जयसेनसमाह्वय· ॥ ५ ॥

विजयो बुद्धिलो गङ्गस्तीव्रव्रतपरायण ।
तपांसि द्वादश प्रज्ञो यश्चक्रे सत्यभावनः ॥ ६ ॥

श्रीगङ्गदेव खलु धर्मसेना एकादशेमे दशपूर्वधारी ।
नक्षत्रसंज्ञो जयपालसंज्ञ पाण्डु सुधर्मो धृतसेनकंसौ ॥ ७ ॥

एकादशाङ्गश्रतधारिणोऽपी शान्त्यन्विता ज्ञानविशेषरम्याः
बभूवुराचारविशेषविज्ञा जीवादितत्वार्थविनिश्चितार्था ॥ ८ ॥

[1] Last year I had submitted this paper to Shri Ātmārāma Commemoration Volume But the Press copy of the Volume, we learn with sorrow, was burnt along with the stocks of Motilal Banarsida Lahore, during the communal disturbances at Lahore soon after the 15th of August, 1947.

सुभद्रश्च यशोभद्रो यशोबाहुश्च लोहक ।
एते जयन्ति चत्वारो ह्याचाराङ्गस्य धारिणः ॥ ९ ॥

तेषां वंशे मूलसंघे गणेऽस्मिन् सेने रम्ये पुष्कराख्ये च गच्छे ।
श्रीमन्तोऽमी संबभूवुर्द्विजेन्द्रा वक्ष्ये तेषामावलिं पट्टभाजाम् ॥ १० ॥

श्रीमन्तो वृषभादिसेनमुनिपा विज्ञानधूताघका
शान्ता दानविचक्षणा जिनमते राद्धान्तसंवेदिनः
आसंवेदनलालसामलमनो भाजन्नराणां सदा
पावित्र्यं कुरुते यदङ्घ्रिकमलं पुण्यं महान्तो बुधाः ॥ ११ ॥

तत्पट्टेऽभवदालसाम्बुजलसत्त्वान्त कृपाभाजनं
श्रीवृद्धादिकुमारसेनमुनिपोऽभूत्संविदा संयुत ।
तत्पट्टे जिनसेनशुद्धमुनिपः सिद्धान्तगैः प्रादरात्
य कोटित्रयशास्त्रसंचयकरः सिद्धान्तरत्नाकरः ॥ १२ ॥

धवलो हि महाधवलो जयधवलो विजयधवलश्च ।
ग्रन्था श्रीमद्भिरमी प्रोक्ताः कविघातकस्तस्मात् ॥ १३ ॥

तत्पट्टे धरसेनकः समभवत्सिद्धान्तग संशुभ
तत्पट्टे खलु वीरसेनमुनिपो वैश्चित्रकूटे पुरे ।
एलाचार्यसमीपगं द्रुततरं सिद्धान्तमभ्यस्य ये
वाटे चैत्यवरे द्विसप्ततितमं सिद्धाचलं चक्रिरे ॥ १४ ॥

विंशातिसहस्रसुमितं जयधवलं चक्रिरे येऽपि ।
तत्पट्टे चत्वारिंशत्सहस्रसंख्यं च जयसेनो ॥ १५ ॥

श्रीसिद्धसेनादिदिवाकराख्यास्तत्पट्टगा वुज्जयनीं विबोध्य
श्रीविक्रमादित्यममुत्रलिङ्गं विकीर्य्य पार्श्वस्य विकासका ध्रुवम् ॥ १६ ॥

समन्तभद्रा खलु तत्र पट्टे स्थित त्रिलिङ्गे विषये सुतीर्थे ।
द्राक्षाभिरामे खलु भीमलिङ्गं विकीर्य चन्द्राभविकासकारा ॥ १७ ॥

तत्पट्टे शिवकोटिक समभवत श्रीगौरसेनस्तत
श्रीसेनाथपदश्च लक्षणयुतश्चारित्रसेनस्तत ।
श्रीभट्टारकपद्मसेनमुनिप श्रीनन्दिषेणस्तथा
सेनोद्दीपपदादिक खलु तत श्रीधर्मसेनः क्रमात ॥ १८ ॥

सिंहसेन ससिंहाख्योऽभयसेनश्च भीमक ।
शान्तिसेनोऽमित सेन कीर्तिसेनस्तत क्रमात ॥ १९ ॥

आचार्यवर्यं गांभीर्यस्थैर्यादिगुणसयुत ।
अनन्तवीर्यो भगवान् भव्यानां भवतारक ॥ २० ॥

तत्पट्टे वीरसेनो यमदमसहितो रैवतेपर्वते यो
हेम्नागुफस्य मध्ये युतिमतिसहित सिद्धचक्रादियन्त्रम् ।
आसीदुद्धारयुक्तं विमलपदयुतं चक्रिरे तत्र पट्टे
श्रीमज्जैनदिसेनो विमलतरसह पौराणकं चक्रिवान् ॥ २१ ॥

श्रीमद्दशरथाख्यांश्च तेषां वै गुरुबन्धव ।
तच्छिष्या गुणभद्राख्यास्तत्पट्टे लोहसेनका ॥ २२ ॥

श्रीनेमिसेना खलु तत्र पट्टे श्रीरामसेना खलु तार्किकाद्याः ।
श्रीवज्रसेनश्च वसन्तसेनो विनीतसेनो विनयेषु धीमान् ॥ २३ ॥

श्रीमन्नागरसेनस्तु विजयश्च मुनीश्वर ।
तपस्सु द्वादशाङ्गेषु रतो जिनपरायण ॥ २४ ॥

विचित्रसेन खलु पूर्णभद्रा श्रीकाचनादि खलु भद्रकाश्च ।
श्रीविष्णुसेन खलु माणिकाख्य श्रीलक्ष्मणाख्य खलु सेनकाश्च ॥ २५ ॥

तत्पट्टे वरवीरसेनमुनिपो भूयो वरज्ञानक
श्रीपद्मादिचरित्रकारिण इमे एकान्तरार्थं तप ।
उग्रं येन कृतं तथा गुणागणो यस्मिन्पदे रम्यके
चक्रे ज्ञानविधूतकल्मषचयो माराजयः संविद ॥ २६ ॥

श्रीमद्विमलसेनस्तु देवसेनस्तत पर ।
सारं पञ्चविधं येन चक्रे ज्ञानवरेण हि ॥ २७ ॥

त्रैविद्यभावसेनार्यो वैय्याकरणशङ्कर ।
श्रीमन्तो जयसेनाश्च अशनादितपोगुणा ॥ २८ ॥

तत्पट्टे गुणसेनक खलु महासेनस्ततो भाविक
श्रीसिन्धुस्थामहिभृतस्यगुरुक प्रद्युम्नकाव्यं जगौ ।
आचार्यो नरसेननाममुनिपो योऽनन्तवीर्यो गुणी
राज्ये राजति राजभद्रमुनिराट् श्रीवीरभद्रस्तत ॥ २९ ॥

श्रीरामभद्रो मुनिनागसेनो महेन्द्रसेनो मुनिभद्रनामा ।
श्रीजैनमार्गाब्धिविवर्धनाय राकापतित्वं समुपागतास्ते ॥ ३० ॥

श्रीसूरीश्वरबंधुपेणविबुधो विद्वज्जनानन्दनो
वादीमानविमर्दनो विजयते श्रीविश्वसेनो यति ।
श्रीछत्रादिपदादिमा खलु तत सेनास्ततश्चार्यका
सेना न स्तत्क्रमाद्भाविनाम् ॥ ३१ ॥

महासेनस्तत पट्टे बभूव गुणिनां गुणी ।
अलंदनगरे येन ब्रह्माह्वानेन सयुजा ॥ ३२ ॥

शान्तिनाथप्रसादेन चक्रे सिद्धान्तवेदिनाम् ।
कृपापरेण विदुषां ज्ञानधृता हि सा किल । ३३ ॥

श्रीमल्लिषेणा मुनयो बभूवुर्गुणैर्युताश्चैव तपोनिषक्ता ।
नानाविधध्वान्तनिवारणैकविज्ञानदक्षा खलु धर्मरक्ता ॥ ३४ ॥

पद्मावतीकल्पमुखास्तु मन्त्रग्रन्था कृता येन सुधीवरेण ।
पञ्चाधिका विंशतिरत्र जाता शास्त्रस्य मंत्रार्थविनिश्चयाय ॥ ३५ ॥

तत्पट्टे वरबाडदेवभुवने त्रैविद्यपुष्पादिक
सेनाबादिविवादमस्तकतुद श्रीहेमसेनस्तत ।
तत्पट्टे ह्यभयादिसेनमुनिपो लक्ष्म्यादिभद्रस्तत
श्रीमज्जैनमते विचक्षणतरा धीमधूवरिस्वामिन ॥ ३६ ॥

श्रीपार्श्वसेना विजयादिसेना श्रीराजसेना अजितादिसेना ।
त्रैविद्यचक्रेश्वरपूर्णावर्णा नरेन्द्रसेना नयसेनसञ्ज्ञा ॥ ३७ ॥

श्रीसूरसेना कमलादिभद्रा आशाधरस्य व्रतदायिनोऽमी ।
देवेन्द्रसेना सुकुमारसेना अभोजनादिप्रतप प्रकारिण ॥ ३८ ॥

उद्दण्डादिविहारपञ्चकशुभप्रावेशसंभाषणा—
दल्लादे खलु खानसञ्ज्ञनृपतेर्बाणव्यथाहारिण ।
कारासंज्ञनिवासिनां च कृपया बंध समाविच्छिदु—
र्गङ्गामध्यविराजिपट्टसवनं त्वल्लावदीनं जगु ॥ ३९ ॥

तत्पट्टे खलु दुर्लभादिकपद सेनस्तत श्रीधर
सेनाकुञ्जरनाथनाथसदसि प्रख्यातशास्त्रेशितु ।
जेता यो यमदण्डसञ्ज्ञविबुधैर्वक्तुं तत श्रीधर
श्रीकान्तीनगरे तु दर्शनसमान् मासान् तु बौद्धै सह ॥ ४० ॥

द्वात्रिंशद्भटभञ्जना खलु तत श्रीषेणसंज्ञा क्रमात्
लक्ष्मीसेनबुधा यमादिसहितास्त्रैविद्यसोमादिमा ।
सेना स्तम्भकतीर्थपूर्वकशिवस्वाम्याख्यवादीरिणो
मान्यो महमुदपातसाहनृपते शिष्यास्तत सबुधा ॥ ४१ ॥

श्रीमत् श्रीश्रुतवीरसंज्ञविबुधा वादीभपञ्चानान
अङ्कुलेश्वरसंज्ञरम्यनगराद् भवस्यसंज्ञं पुरम् ।
गत्वा महमुदपातसाहनृपते श्रीमत्समस्यां गुरुं—
प्रापुर्ये प्रतिदेशकेषु सततं जेजीयकं मुक्तवान् ॥ ४२ ॥

श्रीधरसेना किल देवसेना श्रीदेवभद्रा खलु तत्र पट्टे ।
अथो बभूवु सद्गर्ववादीगजेन्द्रकुम्भस्थलदानसिक्ता ॥ ४३ ॥

सिंहास्थलस्याखिलपूरिधृन्दसुसार्वभौमा किल सोमसेनकाः ।
त्रैविद्यपूर्वा सकलार्हतश्रुतप्रजानरेन्द्र किल वन्दितांघ्रय ॥ ४४ ॥

श्रीमद्भूरिगणैकपात्रनिपुणो भव्याम्बुजाह्लादकृत्
मिथ्यावादिमहेन्द्रभेदनपवि सच्छास्त्रचचूरकाम् ।
वादीन्द्रैकसुसोमसेनयतिराटपट्टोदयाद्रौ रवि
ख्यातः श्रीगुणभद्रसूरिगुरूराट् नन्द्याचिरं भूतले ॥ ४५ ॥

तेषां पट्टे गणी जातो श्रुतवीरो गुणाकर ।
विद्वज्जनसरोजानां मुदे रविरिवानिशम् ॥ ४६ ॥

तत्पट्टे गुणसेनसूरिविदितो विद्वान् सभापंडित
पश्चाच्छ्रीगुणभद्रदेवमुनिपो भव्याम्बुजाह्लादक ।
तर्कव्याकरणादिशास्त्रजलधि श्रीलक्ष्मिसेनस्तत
जीयादिन्दुसमानकीर्तिरमल भट्टारकाधीश्वर ॥ ४७ ॥

॥ इति पट्टावलि ।

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

DHŪRTĀKHYĀNA IN THE NISĪTHA-CŪRNI*

When I wrote my essay 'The Dhūrtākhyāna a Critical Study',[1] I knew from a reference that the *Niśītha-cūrnī* of Jinadāsa-gani Mahattara contained some information about the rogue Elāsādha Prof J C Jain, Bombay, later on informed me that he had read something like the *Dhūrtākhyāna* in that Cūrnī to the text of which unluckily I had no access It is lately that my friends Dr B J Sandesara and Dr U P Shah, Baroda, kindly made availble to me the necessary extracts from the N -cūrnī, cyclostyled-type-script-ed by Ācārya Śrī Vijayapremasūri (Bombay V S 1995), vol I, pp 92-95 The following observations are based on these extracts, which are given at the close of this essay in an Appendix

To begin with there are the following three gāthās of the *Niśīthabhāsya* (nos 294-6) which give the requisite clue words of the illustrative tale

सससएलासाढमूलदेवखंडा य जुण्णउज्जाणे ।
सायंतणे को भत्तं अक्खातं जो ण सद्दहति ॥ २९४ ॥

चोरभया गावीओ पोट्टलए बंधिऊण आणेमि ।
तिलअइरूढकुहाडे वणगय मलणा य तेल्लोदा ॥ २९५ ॥

वणगयपाटणकुंडिय छम्मासा हत्थिलग्गणं पुच्छे ।
रायरयग मो वादे जहि पेच्छइ ते इमे वत्था ॥ २९६ ॥

After these gāthās, the Cūrnī gives in Prākrit prose with a couple of metrical quotations in Sanskrit a fully developed story of the Dhūrthas At the end we have a sentence like this

सेस धुत्तक्खाणगाणुसारेण णेयमिति ॥ गतो लोइयो मुसावातो ।

Looking at the clue words in the gāthās, one can say that the Cūrnī has given all that is obviously hinted in them, but the concluding colophon says that something is remaining and that it should be known from, or completed according to, the *Dhuttakkhānaga*

The story given in the *N -cūrni* may be analysed thus Many Dhūrtas assembled in the Old Park to the north of Ujjainī in the territory of Āvanti Three of them, males Śasaka, Elāsādha, Mūladeva, and the fourth, a female, Khandapānā every one of them had five hundred rogues as their pupils, of their own sex Once during the rains, it was pouring down for a week, oppressed by hunger these rogues wondered who would give them food Mūladeva said 'Let every one narrate his experience or information, one who does not believe it should give a feast to all, but one who confirms it with parallels

* Published in the Vijayavallabhasūri Commemoration Volume, Bombay 1956

[1] This is included in the edition of the *Dhūrtākhyāna* by Jinavijaya Muni, Singhi Jain Series No 19, Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay 1944

from the *Bhārata*, the *Rāmāyana* and other scriptures is not to give anything' All of them said, 'Very well '

Elāsādha narrated this incident 'When I went to the forest with cows, I saw some robbers coming I packed the cows in my blanket, and returned to my village with that luggage to witness the sports of villagers The robbers rushed in there The entire village, all men and animals, entered a cucumber The robbers went away A goat swallowed that cucumber, a boa gulped that goat, a crane picked up that boa and perched on a Vata tree, with one of its legs dangling down An elephant from the king's military camp was tied to it The crane started flying, the elephant was pulled up, there was a hue and cry, and consequently skilled archers shot the crane down Its body was vivisected at king's orders, the boa, the goat, the cucumber were taken one from inside the other The whole village came out of the cubumber along with myself and my cows They all went to their respective places and I came here Now tell me whether this is true ' When they said that this is all true, Elāsādha asked, 'How can a blanket contain all the cows, and a cucumber, the village?' Others added that in the *Bhārata* it is said that the whole universe was under one ocean, there was an Egg in the waters, and the entire universe was contained in that egg, if so, why could not your cows be contained in the blanket, and why could not the village be contained in a cucumber Secondly, the entire universe was in Visnu's stomach, he was in Devakī's womb, and she lay on her bed, similarly, the cucumber, goat, boa and crane could each be contained in the belly of the next.

Śasaka started narrating 'After ploughing the field, sesamum seeds were sown during winter, and they grew into big trees When a wild elephant pursued me, I climbed a sesamum tree It shook the tree and rushed round, showering the seeds and crushing them under its feet There was a stream of oil and lot of mud in which the animal got stuck and died I prepared a bag from its skin and filled it with oil I ate a load of sesamum cakes and drank pots of oil Putting that bag on the branch of a tree, I reached home, my son pulled the tree and took the bag This is my experience one who does not accept it should give the feast ' Others added thus These ideas are found in scriptures like the *Bhārata* and the *Rāmāyana* A stream in which the entire army was plunged is described Secondly, a big sesamum plant is not impossible, for it is said that at Pātaliputra a drum was carved out of a māsa plant '

Mūladeva then narrated 'As a youth, yearning for prosperity, I proceeded to the abode of Īśvara for a bath with a gourd-kettle and an umbrella in hand A wild elephant rushed against me There being no other alternative I entered the gourd-kettle through the spout The elephant also followed me, but I could delude and evade it for six months inside Then I escaped through the spout, the elephant also pursued me, but its tail-end was caught there I reached the Ganges which I crossed easily, and took the stream of it on my head for six months Then I saluted Mahāsena, came back here and met you all Either accept this as true or give a feast to all the rogues ' Others added thus 'What you say is true and reasonable Brāhmanas, etc , came out from the different parts of Brahmā's body in which the entire population was contained, similarly, the elephant and yourself could be contained in a gourd-kettle Secondly, Brahmā and Visnu could not reach the terminus of the Linga even after many years, still Umā's body could accommodate it, similarly an elephant and yourself could be contained in the kundikā Thirdly, when Visnu was reposing in the ocean, Brahmā came out of his navel,

but the lotus (stalk) was stuck at it, similarly the tip of the tail could be stuck even when you both came out of the spout Fourthly, Rāma ordered Sugrīva to get news about Sītā, Hanūmat was entrusted with this mission which he fulfilled by crossing the ocean by his arms, similarly you also could cross the Ganges Lastly, when Gangā was invited on the earth, Paśupati received her in his matted hair for years together, similarly you could receive the stream of the Ganges for six months'

In reply to Khandapānā's suggestion, the Dhūrtas said that they would not sacrifice their self-respect for a meal She smiled and started narrating thus 'I am the daughter of a king's washerman Accompanied by my retinue I went to the river with a cart-load of clothes to be washed All the clothes spread in the sun were blown off by the wind Being afraid of the king, I became a lizard and entered the garden where I changed myself into a mango tree I heard one day that washermen were all forgiven, so I became myself once more The ropes and stripes of the cart were eaten by jackals, so my father got them prepared from a buffalo's tail Tell me whether you accept all this as true ' Others said in this manner 'If it is true that Brahmā and Keśava could not reach the terminus of the Linga, how is it that your statement is not true Secondly, it is heard in the *Rāmāyana* that Hanūmat had a long tail, which, covered with rags and sprinkled with oil, was lit up and thereby Lankā was burnt, similarly ropes could be prepared from a buffalo's tail Thirdly, we hear in the scripture that King Gandharva became a dwarf, that Kimaśva became a boa at Indra's curse, and that a boa asked with a human voice seven questions to Dharma who answered them and rescued his brother and then became King Ravi on the termination of the curse Similarly, that you became a lizard and then again yourself is quite believable '

Then Khandapānā suggested to them to submit to her lest they might be humiliated, but they were proud of their dignity She smiled and continued 'With king's permission I went out in search of my slave-servants who had run away, I visited many villages and towns, and here I find that those slave servants are yourselves and those clothes are on your body, if true, give the clothes, if false, give the feast What is said is significant '

It is necessary to compare Jinadāsa's Dhūrtākhyāna (JD) with Haribhadra's Dhūrtākhyāna (HD) In JD there are only four Dhūrtas while in HD there are five, the additional name being that of Kandarīka The order of their enumeration is slightly different, and Mūladeva does not occupy a very prominent position in JD as he does in HD In JD Elāsādha, Śaśaka, Mūladeva and Khandapānā narrate their experiences one after the other, their experiences being confirmed by all the rogues and not by any one specifically as in HD What Elāsādha narrates as his experience in JD is put in the mouth of Kandarīka in HD where Elāsādha confirms it with Purānic stories The patterns of the stories narrated by Śaśaka, Mūladeva and Khandapānā are the same in both, with the difference that Mūladeva is given the third turn in JD and the narration of Khandapānā is substantially longer in HD with the result that the whole tale assumes a different form at the close in HD That which is put in the mouth of Elāsādha by HD is absent in JD

What Elāsādha narrates in JD has some additional details in HD It is confirmed by other rogues by only two parallel events from the *Bhārata* etc , in JD, but by six parallel stories in HD The patterns of experiences of Śaśaka and Mūladeva are basically the same in both, but if JD confirms them with two and five similar contexts from the

śrutis, HD gives ten and eight parallels Thus it is obvious that HD draws upon a wider range of mythology and gives meticulously more episodes to confirm the obviously incredible details of personal experiences

Comparing similar contexts one finds that the narration in JD is uniformly simple and direct Words and phrases from it are bodily found in HD It is interesting to compare common expressions in JD and HD in similar contexts A few passages[1] are reproduced below

JD	HD
(१) उज्जेणी णाम नगरी, तीसे उत्तरपासे जिण्णुज्जाणं णाम उज्जाणं। तत्थ बहवे धुत्ता समागया। एक्केक्कस्स पंच पंच धुत्तसता, धुत्तीणं पंचसयं खंडपाणाए। अह अण्णाया पाउसकाले सत्ताहवद्दले भुक्खत्ताणं इमेरिसी कहा संवुत्ता। को अम्हं देज भत्तं ति। मूलदेवो भणति। जं जेणणुभूयं सुयं वा सो तं कहयतु। जो तं ण पत्तियति तेण सव्वधुत्तणं भत्तं दायव्वं। etc	(१) उज्जेणी णाम णामेण ॥ २ ॥ तीसे उत्तर पासे उज्जाणं ॥ ३ ॥ तत्थ धुत्ताण सयाणेगा समागया ॥ ४ ॥ इक्किक्कस्स य तेसिं धुत्ताणं पंच पंच सया ॥ ७ ॥ धुत्तीण पंचसया खंडवणाए ॥ ८ ॥ सत्ताहदुद्दिणम्मि ॥ १० ॥ सीअवद्दलाभिहया। भुक्खत्ता बिंति तहिं को अम्हं दिज्ज भत्तं ति ॥ ११ ॥ अह भणइ मूलदेवो जं जेण सुअं च समणुभूअं वा। तो तं कहेउ सव्वं ॥१२॥ जो तं न पत्तिइज्जा तेण सव्वेसिं। धुत्ताणं दायव्वं भतपाणं ति ॥ १३ ॥
(२) चोरा कळयलं करेमाणा तत्थेव णिवतिता। सो य गामो सदुपदचउप्पदो एक्क वालुंकं दविट्ठो वडपायवे णिलीणा सहवेहिणो गहियचावा पत्ता पतगसेणा इव भूबिलाओ सो गामो वालुकातो निग्गंतुमारद्धो।	(२) कलयलखं करिंता पडिया चोरा णवरि तत्थ ॥ २-१० ॥ तो सो सबालवुड्ढो सइत्थिओ जणवओ सपसुवग्गो। अह चोडएहिं सहिओ वालुकं अइगओ सव्वो ॥ ११ ॥ सा तत्थेव णिलीणा तुंगे वडपायवे विउले ॥ १४ ॥ सपत्ता सद्दवेहिणो जोहा। इसुचावगहियहत्था ॥ १७ ॥ अह सलभाण य सेणा रेप्फबिळाओ विणिक्खमइ ॥ २३ ॥
(३) तरुणत्तणे अहं इच्छियसुहाभिलासी धारधरणट्टताए सामिगिहं पट्ठितो छत्तकमंडलहत्थो पेच्छामि य वणगय मम वहाए एज्जमाणं, ततो अहं भीतो अत्ताणो असरणो किंचि णिलुक्कणट्ठाणं अपस्समाणो दगच्छड्डणणालएण कमंडलं अतिगओ म्हि। सो वि गयवरो मम वहाए तेणेव[णालए-]ण अतिगतो। ततो मे सो गयवरो छम्मास अंतोकुंडीयाए वामोहिओ etc	(३) तरुणत्तणम्मि अहय इच्छिअसुहसंपय अहिलसतो धाराधरणटठाए सामिगिहं पत्थिओ सुइरं ॥ १-१८ ॥ छत्तकमंडलुहत्थो पिच्छामि अ गयवरं इंतं ॥ १९ ॥ अत्ताणो अ असरणो कत्थ णिलुक्कामि हं ति चिंतंतो तो सहसा य अइगओ कमंडलुं ॥ २१ ॥ मज्झाणुमग्गलग्गो कमंडलुं अइगओ सिग्घं ॥ २२ ॥ हत्थि कमंडलुम्मी वामोहेऊण छम्मासं etc

[1] The Prākrit passages reproduced in this paper are exactly as they are in the extracts supplied to me I am aware, they present some difficulties of interpretation in some places

The two Sanskrit quotations found in JD are also there in the same context in HD (namely, *teṣāṁ* etc , HD 4-20, and *tava prasādāt* etc HD 1-87*1) HD adds more dignified descriptions here and there, and additional details are presented in it in smooth gāthās JD wants just an illustration of Laukika-musāvāda, and whatever is given by the Cūrnī serves that purpose

HD has its own characteristics It is an independent treatise put in a well thought-out satirical frame the opening and concluding portions fully bear out this The satirical effect in HD is worked out more logically and in a subtle and effective manner, which is conspicuously absent in JD What HD adds after 5-76 has nothing corresponding to it in JD, and it may not be just an accident that the major portion of it is composed in a heavy style In its concluding portion HD puts together a number of detached episodes, especially from the *Bhārata* and *Rāmāyana*, and asserts that all of them are incredible

From the extract, I am inclined to believe that the Cūrnī gives all that is hinted in the Bhāsya-gāthās The colophon *śesam dhuttakkhānagānusārena neyam iti* if it is genuine and belongs to the author of the Cūrnī, would lead us to the conclusion that there was a longer *Dhuttakkhāna* in Prākrit prose from which the major portion is extracted by the Cūrnī

The objective comparison of JD and HD leads me to the conclusion that HD is an elaborated and perfected work based on JD or its predecessor as postulated above The reasons for this may be stated as below

(1) JD is uniformly shorter in its pattern tales and confirmatory episodes from the Purānas all of which are better worked out with supplementary details in HD

(2) HD incorporates everything in JD and adds more details to it

(3) The simple and narrative details of JD are presented in a more elaborate manner and polished style in HD

(4) The number of characters and of references to Purānic tales increases in HD, which presents them more logically and effectively

(5) What is a simple narrative illustration in JD is enlarged into an effective satire in HD with seeds of religious propaganda which are later on elaborated in the *Dharmaparīksā* texts

Thus Haribhadra has built his satirical masterpiece incorporating or using both words and ideas from an earlier *Dhuttakkhāna* preserved in the Cūrnī By his literary genius, logical acumen and wide learning he has shaped the simple stuff into a dignified literary masterpiece, unique in Indian literature

The above objective comparison of the two versions in the JD and HD and the conclusion that Haribhadra used for his *Dhūrtākhyāna* the story given in the Cūrnī does not in any way violate the relative chronology of the two authors, Jinadāsa and Haribhadra Jinadāsagani Mahattara, the author of *N Cūrni*, has also written a Cūrnī on the *Nandīsūtra* which was composed by him in Śaka 598 or 677 A D [1] and Haribhadra is assigned to a period about 750 A D [2]

[1] Shri Jinavijaya The Date of Haribhadrasuri, A Paper read at the First Oriental Conference, Poona 1919, p 144 H Jacobi *Samarāiccakahā*, Calcutta 1926, Intro p iii

[2] A portion of this essay was presented to the Prākrit and Jainism Section of the XVII Session of the All-India Oriental Conference, Ahmedabad

APPENDIX

(The story from the *N Cūrṇī* is presented here with minor corrections, adjustments in punctuation etc)

अवंती । उज्जेणी णाम नगरी, तीसे उत्तरपासे जिण्णुज्जाणं णाम उज्जाणं । तत्थ बहवे धुत्ता समागय ससगो, एलासाढो, मूलदेवो, खंडपाणा य इत्थिया। एक्केक्कस्स पच पंच धुत्तसता धुत्तीणं पंचसयं खंडपाणाए। अह अण्णया पाउसकाले सत्ताहवद्दले भुक्खत्ताणं इमेरिसी कहा संवुत्ता। को अम्हं देज्ज भत्तं ति । मूलदेवो भणति 'जं जेणणुभूयं सुयं वा सो तं कहयतु, जो तं ण पत्तियति तेण सव्वधुताणं भत्तं दायव्व । जो पुण भारहरामायणसुतीसमुत्थाहि उवणयउववतीहिं पतीहिति सो मा किंचि दलयतु'। एवं मूलदेवेण भणिते सव्वेहिं वि भणियं 'साहु साहु' त्ति । ततो मूलदेवेण भणिय 'को पुव्वं कहयति'। एलासाढेण भणिय 'अहं मे कहयामि'।

तत सो कहिउमारद्धो । "अहं गावीओ गहाय अडवि गओ, पेच्छामि चोरे आगच्छमाणे । तो मे पावरणी-कंबली पत्थरिऊणं तत्थ गावीओ छुभिऊणाहं पोटटलयं बंधिऊण गाममागतो, पेच्छामि य गाममज्झयारे गोद्दहे रममाणे। ताहं गहिय गावो ते पेच्छिउमारद्धो। खणमेत्तेण य चोरा कलयलं करेमाणा तत्थेव णिवतिता । सो य गामो सदुपदचउप्पदो एक्कं वालुकं पविट्ठो । ते य चोरा पडिगया । तं पि वालुंकं एगाए अजियाए गसियं । सा वि अइआ चरमाणा अयगलेण गसिया । सो वि अयगलो एक्काए ढंकाए गहितो । सा उड्डिउं वडपायवे णिलीणा । तीसे य एगो पाओ वलंबति । तस्स य वडपायवस्स अहे खधावारो ठिओ । तमि य ढेंकापाए गयवरो आगलितो । सा उड्डिउं पयत्ता । आगासित्व पाओ, गयवरो कड्ढिउमारद्धो । लोवेहिं कलयलो कओ । तत्थ सद्देवेहिणो गहियचावा पत्ता । तेहिं सा जमगसमगं सरेहिं पूरिता मता । रण्णा तीए पोट्टं फाडावियं । अयगरो दिट्ठो, सो वि फाडाविओ । अजिया दिट्ठा, सा वि फाडाविआ । वालुकं दिट्ठ रमणिज्जं । एत्थंतरे ते गोद्दहा उपरता । पतंगसेणा [illegible] भूबिलाओ सो गामो वालुकातो निग्गंतु मारद्धो । अहं पि गहिय गाओ णिग्गतो । सव्वो सो जणो सट्ठाणाणि गतो । अहं पि अवउज्झिय गाओ इहमागतो । तं भणह कहं सच्चं ।" सेसगा भणंति 'सच्चं सच्चं' । एलासाढो भणति 'कहं गावीओ कंबलीए मायाओ', गामो वा वालुंके' । सेसगा भणंति 'भरहसुतीए सुव्वति जहा पुव्वं आसी एगण्णवं जगं सव्व, तम्मि य जले अंडं आसी । तम्मि य अंडगे ससेलवणकाणणं जगं सव्वं जति मायं तो [p 93] तुह कंबलीए गावो वालुके वा गामो ण माहिति । जं भणसि जहा ढेंकूदरे अयगलो तस्स य अतिआ तीए वालुकं एत्थ वि भण्णति उत्तरं । ससुरासुरं सनारकं ससेलवणकाणणं जगं सव्वं जइ विण्हुस्सुदरे मातं सो वि य देवतीउदरे मातो, सा वि य सयणिज्जे माता, जइ एय सच्चं तो तुह वयणं कहं असच्च भविस्सति ।'

ततो ससगो कहिउमारद्धो । "अम्हे कर्कुविपुत्ता, कयाइं च करिसाणातिं । अहं सरयकाले खेत्तं अहिगओ। तम्मि य छेत्ते तिलो वुत्तो। सो य एरिसो जातो जो परं कुहाडेहिं छेत्तव्वो। तं समंता परिभमामि, पेच्छामि य आरण्णं गयवरं। तेणम्हि उच्छित्तो, पळातो, पेच्छामि, य अइप्पमाणं तिलरुक्खं, तम्मि विलग्गो पत्तो य गयवरो । सो मं अपावंतो कुलालचक्कं व तं तिलरुक्खं परिभमति, चालेति तत्थ तिलरुक्खं । तेण य चालिते जलहरो विव तिलो तिलवुट्ठिं मुंचति । तेण य भमंतेण चक्कतिला विव ते तिला पिलिता । तओ तेल्लोदा णाम णदी वूढा। सो य गयो तत्थेव तिलचलणीए खुतो मओ य। मया वि से चम्मं गहियं

दतितो कतो, तेल्लरसभरितो। अहं पि खुधितो खलभारं भक्खयामि, दस तेल्लघडा तिसितो पियामि। तं च तेल्लपडिपुण्णं दइयं घेत्तुं गामं पट्ठिओ। गामबहिया रुक्खसालाए णिक्खिविउं तं दइयं गिहमतिगतो। पुत्तो य मे दइयस्स पेसिओ। सो तं जाहे ण पावइ ताहे रुक्खं पाडेउ गेण्हेत्था। अहं पि गिहाओ णिओट्ठि परिभमंतो इहमागओ। एयं पुण मे अणुभूतं। जो ण पत्तियति सो देउ भत्तं"। सेसगा भणंति 'अत्थि एसो य भावो भारहरामायणे सुतीसु णज्जति।

> तेषां कटतटभ्रष्टैर्गजानां मदबिन्दुभिः।
> प्रावर्तत नदी घोरा हस्त्यश्वरथवाहिनी॥ १॥

जं भणसि कहं एमहंतो तिलरुक्खो भवति। एत्थ भण्णति—पाडलिपुत्ते किल मासपादवे भेरी णिम्मविया, तो किह तिलरुक्खो एमहतो ण होज्जाहि'।

तत्तो मूलदेवो कहिउमारद्धो। सो भणति "तरुणत्तणे अहं इच्छियसुहाभिलासी धाराधरणट्ठताए सामिगिहं पट्ठितो छत्तकमंडलहत्थो, पेच्छामि य वणगयं मम वहाए एज्जमाणं। ततो अहं भीतो अत्ताणो असरणो किंचि णिलुक्कणट्ठाणं अपस्समाणो दगच्छड्डणणालएणं कमंडलं अतिगओ म्हि। सो वि गयवरो मम वहाए तेणेवंतं अतिगतो। ततो मे सो गयवरो छम्मासं अंतोकुडीयाए वामोहिओ। तओ हं छम्मासंते कुंडियगीवाए णिग्गतो। सो वि य गयवरो तणवंतेण णिग्गतो, णवरं वालग्गं ते कुंडियगीवाते लग्गो। अहमवि पुरतो पेच्छामि अणोरपारं गंगं। सा मे गोपयमिव तिण्णा। गतो म्हि सामिगिहं। तत्थ मे तण्हाछुहासमे अगणेमाणेण छम्मासा धारिया धारा। ततो पणमिऊण महारूणं पयाओ सपत्तो उज्जेणि तुब्भं च इहं मिलिओ इति। तं जइ एयं सच्चं तो मे हेऊहिं पत्तियावेह। अहमण्णह अलियं ति घुत्ताण देह तो भत्तं।" तेहिं भणियं 'सच्चं'। मूलदेवो भणइ 'कह सच्चं'। ते भणंति 'सुणेह। जइ पुव्वं बंभाणस्स मुहातो विप्पा णिग्गया, बाहओ खत्तिया, ऊरूसु वइस्सा, पदेसु सुद्दसुद्दा। जइ इत्तिओ जणवओ तस्सुदरे माओ तो तुमं हत्थी य कुंडियाए ण माहिह। अण्णं च किल बंभाणा विण्हू य उड्ढाहं धावंतो गता दिव्वं वास सहस्सं तहा वि लिंगस्संतो ण पत्तो। तं जइ एमहंतं लिंगं उमाए सरीरे मातं तो तुहं हत्थी य कुंडियाए ण माहिह। जं भणसि वालग्गे हत्थी कहं लग्गो, तं सुणसु। विण्हू जगस्स कता [p 94] एगण्णवे तप्पति तवं जलसयणगतो, तस्स य णाभीओ बंभा पउमगब्भणिभो णिग्गातो णवरं पंकयणाभीए लग्गो, एवं जइ तुमं हत्थी य विणिग्गतो हत्थी वालग्गे लग्गो को दोसो। जं भणसि गंगा कहं उत्तिण्णो, रामेण किल सीताए पव्वत्तिहेउं सुग्गीवो आणत्तो, तेणावि हणुमंतो, सो बाहाहिं समुद्दं तरिउं लंकापुरिं पत्तो, दिट्ठा सीता, पडिणियत्तो। सीयाभत्तुणा पुच्छितो कह समुद्दो तिण्णो भणाति।

> तव प्रसादात् तव च प्रसादाद् भर्तुश्च ते देवि तव प्रसादात्।
> साधूजते येन पितु प्रसादात्तीर्णो मया गोष्पदवत्समुद्र.।

जइ तेण तिरिएण समुद्दो बाहाहिं तिण्णो तुमं कहं गंगं ण तरिस्ससि। जं भणसि कहं छम्मासे धारा धरिता, एत्थ वि सुणसु। लोगहितत्था सुरगणेहिं गंगा अब्भत्थिता 'अवतराहि मणुयलोगं'। तीए भणियं 'को मे धरेहिति णिवडिंतीं'। पसुवतिणा भणियं 'अहं ते एगजडाए धारयामि'। तेण सा दिव्वं वाससहस्सं धरिता। जइ तेण सा धरिता तुमं कहं छम्मासं ण धरिस्ससि।'

अह पत्तो खंडपाणा कहितुमारद्धा। सा य भणइ। 'ओलंबितं ति अम्हेहिं जइ अंजलिं करित्थ सीसे ओसप्पेह जति न ममं तो भत्तं देमि सव्वेसिं'। तो ते भणंति 'घुत्ती, अम्हे सव्वं जगं तुलेमाणा

किह एवं दीणवयणं तुब्भ सगासे भणिहामो'। ततो ईसिं हसेऊण खंडपाणा कहयति "अहगं रायरज-कस्स धूया। अहं अण्णया सह पित्रा वत्थाण महासगडं भरेऊण पुरिससहस्सेण समं णदिं सलिलपुण्णं पत्ता। थोयाणि वत्थाइं, तो आयवदिण्णाणि उव्वायाणि। आगतो महावातो। तेण ताणि सव्वाणि वत्थाणि अवहरिताणि। ततो हं रायभया गोहारूवं काऊण रयणीए णगरुज्जाणं गता। तत्थ हं चूयलया जाता। अण्णया य सुणेमि जहा रयगा उम्मिट्ठंतु अभयो सिं। पडहसद्दं सोऊण पुण णवसरीरा जाया। तस्स य सगडस्स णाडग वरत्ता य जंबुएहि छागेहिं भक्खिताओ। तओ मे पिउणा णाडगवरत्ताओ अण्णिस्समाणेण महिसपुच्छा लद्धा, तत्थ णाडगवरत्ता वलिता। तं भणह किमेत्थ सच्चं"। ते भणंति। 'बंभकेसवा अंतं न गता लिंगस्स जति त सच्चं, तुह वयणं कह असच्चं भविस्सइ' त्ति रामायणे वि सुणिज्जति जह हणुमतस्स पुच्छं महंतं आसी, तं च किल अणगेहिं वत्थसहस्सेहिं वेढिऊण तेल्लघडस-हस्सेहिं सिंचिऊण पलीवियं, तेण किल लंकापुरी दड्ढा। एवं जति महिसस्स वि महंतपुच्छेण णाडग-वरत्ताओ जायाओ को दोसो। अण्णं च इमं सुई सुव्वति जहा। गंधारो राय रण्णे कुडवत्तणं पत्तो, अवरो वि राय किंमस्सो णाम महाबलपरक्कमो, तेण य सक्को देवराया समरे णिज्जिओ, ततो तेण देवरायेण सावसत्तो रण्णे अयगलो जातो, अण्णया य पंडुसुआ रज्जयभट्ठा रण्णं ट्ठिता, अण्णया य एगागि णीगतो भीमो, तेण य अयगरेण गसितो, धमसुतो य अयगरस्स मूलं पत्तो, ततो सो अयगरो माणुसीए वायाए तं धम्मसुतं सत्त पुच्छातो पुच्छति, तेण य कहितातो सत्त पुच्छातो, ततो भीमं णिग्गिलइ, तस्स सावस्स अंतो जातो, जातो पुण रविराया। जइ एयं सच्चं, तो तुमं पि सब्भूतं गोहाभूय सभावं गंतूण पुणण्णवा जाता'। तो खंडपाणा भणति 'एव गते वि मज्झ पणामं करेह, जइ कहंचि जिप्पह, तो काणा वि वव्वडिया तुब्भ मुल्लं ण भवति'। ते भणंति 'को म्हे सत्तो णिज्जिऊण'। तो सा हसिऊण भणति 'तेसि वातहरियाण वत्थाण गवेसणाय णिग्गया रायाणं पुच्छिऊण, अण्णं च मम दासचेडा णट्ठा, ते य अण्णिस्सामि, ततो हं गामणगराणि अडमाणी इहं पत्ता, तं ते दासचेडा तुब्भे, ताणि वत्थाणिमाणि जाणि तुब्भ परिहियाणि, जइ सच्चं तो देह वत्था, अह अलियं तो देह भत्त।' असुण्णत्थं भणियमिणं।

सेस धुत्तक्खाणगाणुसारेण णेयमिति ॥ गतो लोइयो मुसावातो।

PAÑCAVIMŚATI OF PADMANANDI*

1 PADMANANDI-PAÑCAVIMŚATI TITLE AND TEXT

The present edition of the *Padmanandi-pañcaviṃśatiḥ* (Pp), 'A Collection of Twenty five Texts', is a decided improvement on its earlier editions, because some independen Mss have been collated (see the Hindī Introduction for the detailed description), th available Sanskrit commentary is added along with the text, and a carefully prepared Hind *anuvāda*, along with *bhāvārtha*, is also given

The *Pp* is a suitable title given to a collection of texts which comprises some twenty-fiv small and big works of the *prakarana* type, each of which deals with some religious o didactic topic, not necessarily connected with the preceding or the following *prakaran* Each *prakarana* has a title of its own which at times indicates the contents (as in I, II, VI VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI,XVIII and XXI) and at times contents a well as the number of verses in it (as in III, IV, V, XI,XVII, XIX, XX, XXII, XXIII XXIV, XXV and XXVI) Usually each one has a *mangala* and is duly rounded at th close Most of them are religio-didactic discourses, but a few of them are hymnal o nearly hymnal (VIII, IX, XIII-XVIII, XX and XXI) and ritualistic (XIX) in characte and coming in a group as it were Excepting two *prakaranas* (XIII and XIV), which ar hymns or prayers in Prākrit *gāthās*, addressed to Rsabha and Jinavara, all others are i Sanskrit in long and short metres

This collective title, *Pp*, is found in many Mss , both in the north and south [1] It i obvious that one more *prakarana*, perhaps the last one, has been added later with the resul that in this collection there are twenty-six texts, though it is called *pañcaviṃśatiḥ* in th colophon of the Sanskrit Commentary There are reasons to believe that all these *praka ranas* were, to begin with, independent texts, before they were put together under common title First, there are available separate Mss of most of these individual works in some cases accompanied by Kannada commentary as well Secondly, each text is quit an independent unit, having hardly any connection with the earlier or the following sectior Thirdly, the same topic is found discussed in more than one *prakarana* Ordinarily, thi is not likely, if the author intended all these texts to go together as one unit Lastly, som verse or topic is repeated in different *prakaranas* The author is a meditative poet, an naturally he expresses himself alike, if not identical, in various contexts

The method of exposition in most of the *prakaranas* is of the nature of didactic antho logy with the result that a verse here or there can be subsequently added In some cases the author himself has specified the number of verses in a *prakarana*, and if this is violate

* This is the Introduction to the Padmanandi-Pañcaviṃsati, published in the Jivaraja J Granthamāl Sholapur 1962

[1] H D VELANKAR *Jina-ratnakośa*, (Poona 1944), p 233, K B SHASTRI *Kannaḍa-prāntiya tāḍa patrīya Grantha-sūcī* (Banaras 1948), pp 52, 209

[2] H D VELANKAR *Ibid*, pp 197, 172, 7, 61, 317, 56, 180, 438, 34, 412, 215, 286, 59, 136, 398 458, 445, 381, 135, 68, 96, 61, 238, 378, 456 and 286, also K B SHASTRI Ibidem, p 319.

by the present text, it means that some verses are added later on Some *prakaranas* are called *astakas* some of them, as the designation requires, have actually eight verses (XVII, XX, XXIV and XXV), while others have nine (V and XXVI) or ten (XIX) verses. The rounding of an *astaka* with a concluding verse seems to have become conventional, and the presence of the 10th verse in XIX *JP* is necessitated by the ritualistic details that the offering of eight *dravyas* is followed by *arghya* or *puspāñjali*, and rounded by the author's reference to himself and to the fruit of the *pūjā* or worship There is a clear discrepancy, excepting in two cases, between the author's specification of the number of verses and the one found in the present text as noted below

Prakarana		*Specified No*	*Actual No*
II	*DU*	52	54[1]
III	*AP*	50	55
IV	*ES*	70	80
XI	*NP*	50	62
XII	*BR*	22	22
XXII	*EB*	10	11
XXIII	*PV*	20	20

In some cases, the context itself may indicate that a verse is added later on, for instance, verse No 11, in XXII *EB* It is necessary that Mss unaccompanied by the Sanskrit commentary and preferably from the south will have to be scrutinised for ascertaining the verses which are added later on despite author's specification of the number of verses A careful study of three palm-leaf Mss (in Kannada characters) of the *Ekatva-saptati*[2] shows that it has only 74 verses according to them, that verses Nos 9, 53, 55, 74, 78 and 80 are not found in them, and that 79 is the last but one and 77 the concluding verse It has to be admitted that even the Kannada Mss have four verses more than the number specified by the author It has to be seen whether some of them were *uktam ca* to begin with, but got mixed up later in the text The attempt of the Sanskrit commentary to call it *Ekatvāśītih*, against verse No 77, is irrelevant If some Mss from Moodbidri are collated, these verses can be easily marked out Likewise, a palm-leaf Ms (in Kannada characters)[3] of XIV *JS* omits gāthā No 11 of the printed text and has only 33 verses in all

2 Analysis of the Contents

The contents of the various *prakaranas* may be surveyed in short to get a broad idea of the topics covered by them

I. The *Dharmopadeśāmrtam* (*DA*, verses 198) 'The Nectar of Religious Instruction' This is a lengthy disquisition on *dharma*, partly systematic and partly anthological in its make-up, and written in a fluent style and high didactic tone It opens with *mangala*

[1] Verses 7 and 42 are almost identical

[2] These Mss were studied by Dr A N Upadhye as early as 1930 One belongs to the Laksmisena Matha, Kolhapur, the second, to the Jaina Siddhānta Bhavana, Arrah, and the third, to the personal collection of the late lamented Pt Appashastri, Udagaon (Dist Kolhapur)

[3] This belongs to the Jaina Siddhānta Bhavana, Arrah, and was made available to Shri A N Upadhye in 1930 by Pt K B Shastri

glorifying Ṛṣabha Jina, in meditation, Śāntinātha etc, who are the promulgators of Dharma Dharma has varying connotation in different contexts It means compassion to living beings, it is two-fold, for laymen and for monks, it consists of Right faith, Right knowledge and Right conduct, it is ten-fold *uttamakṣamā* etc, and ultimately, it is the spiritual manifestation, pure and blissful, and divested of the deluding distractions of mind, speech and body (7)

Compassion or kindness to life is most important, the veritable basis of all religious life, which, for a layman, is covered by 11 Pratimās (14) for the practice of which must be relinquished the 7 Vyasanas, *dyūta* etc, which are obviously foul, anti-social and full of sin The Yati-dharma, the religious duty of a monk, consists of five-fold *ācāra*, ten-fold *dharma*, *samyama* or self-restraint, *mūla* and *uttara-gunas* etc, culminating into *samādhi-marana*, this enables one to reach Final Bliss (38)

Attachment for everything, including the body, has to be given up negligence, passions and possessions are all harmful for spiritual progress An omniscient Teacher is not accessible now, but his words are available in the scriptures which must be followed Great monks who practise equanimity, forbearance etc, and meditation deserve respect and glorification Human birth is difficult to be obtained, if it is there, the best advantage of it has to be taken for the practice of penance and consequent termination of Saṃsāra which is full of temptations The words of Jina are a guide to all, and enable one to experience the eternal sentient effulgence The unique nature of the sentient Real has to be realized, it is separate from and above everything else which is all worthless One should seek shelter of those who have realized this This exposition is concluded with eloquent glorification of Dharma

II The *Dānopadeśanam* (*DU*, verses 54) 'Instruction on Charity' King Śreyāns is the ideal example of a donor who gave gift of food to the first Tīrthakara with a religious object A layman incurs a good bit of sin in his domestic and vocational routine pious giving of gifts is a balancing and redeeming feature for him So, he should give food etc, to a worthy recipient The houses and house-holders who have no contacts with monks are not in any way commendable The merit acquired by *dāna* is highly fruitful, and hence wealth must be expended in that direction without waiting for this or that, which is all uncertain The riches spent on temples, worship, entertaining monks and sustaining the learned and on redressing the poverty of the miserable, that alone belongs to oneself and the rest goes to others A man's life without charity is not worth living the four-fold gifts given properly yield great benefit here and elsewhere

III The *Anitya-pañcāśat* (*AP*, verses 55) 'Fifty Stanzas on Transitoriness' It is expounded here with suitable illustrations and similes that the body, relative, pleasures etc, are all transitory, the end certainly comes according to one's Karmas, so one should not lament over one's lot Meeting in this life is like that of birds for a night on the tree Meeting and separation have to be faced with detachment, without any joy or sorrow One should ever be devoted to Dharma

IV The *Ekatva-saptatih* (*ES*, verses 80) 'Seventy Stanzas on oneness or Separateness (of Ātman)' The eternal Parmātman characterised by sentiency, bliss and existence is glorified, and the sentient effulgence is hailed with reverence The sentient Real, the

Ātman, is, like fire in wood, in every one of us, but, being under long-standing delusion, one does not realize this If a beneficial Teacher explains it, a few respect it, but most behave like the blind feeling the elephant The Vītarāga shows the correct path, and a *bhavya*, by virtue of his *labdhis*, is on the path of Liberation consisting of three jewels. The sentient Real alone is worth realizing by experience Attachment and aversion (*rāga* and *dveṣa*) have to be avoided, and the sentient Real is above dualities and too great to be described in words It is realized in the Great Meditation which is variously named and described

V The *Yatibhāvanāṣṭakam* (*YB*, verses 9) 'Eight stanzas of Reflections on Munis' The author glorifies the Yatis, Munis or monks by specifying their outstanding qualities They have accepted renunciation, and are free from attachment even for the body They control their senses and concentrate their mind on the Ātman They practise penances and are plunged in meditation even under unfavourable climate and adverse conditions

VI The *Upāsaka-saṃskārah* (*US*, verses 62) 'Moulding of a layman' This is almost a manual on House-holder's Dharma Ṛsabha preached the Dharma and king Śreyāns was the first to practise it Mokṣa is reached through Dharma constituted of Right faith, Right knowledge and Right conduct, and practised in two ways, one by a Nirgrantha, a monk, and the other by a Gṛhin, Śrāvaka, householder or layman The Śrāvaka or layman is the support of the temple,[1] monk, piety and charity these constitute the religious routine to-day He has to observe Six Duties, *devapūjā* etc (7f), has to be a religiously balanced and integrated personality, and must cultivate *sāmāyika* (8) which is possible only by giving up the *vyasanas* (10) He should also practise 8 *mūlagunas* and 12 vows etc , and live in such a place and practise such a profession as will not come in the way of his religious life He should practise Ahiṃsā, be philanthropic and sociable, reflect on 12 Anuprekṣās and be intent on ten-fold Dharma He should meditate inwardly on his pure Ātman and practise outwardly kindness to all beings Lastly, his mind should ever be fixed on the realization of sentient effulgence which is separate from everything else

VII The *Deśavratoddyotanam* (*DV*, verses 27) 'Light on the *deśa*=or *anu-vratas*' It is an exposition on the career of a Śrāvaka By penances and through meditation all the Karmas must be consumed and Liberation attained that is the highest object for the human being If that is found beyond the reach of any individual, he should lead the life of a sincere Śrāvaka or layman by practising the prescribed code of behaviour (5-6) Giving gifts to the worthy is a great balancing virtue for him Śrāvakas are a great support of the community life, both social and religious (20) With devotion, it is they who build temples, consecrate images of Jina and celebrate religious festivities and thus, through *dharma*, they are on the path of *mokṣa*

VIII The *Siddha-stutih* (*SS*, verses 29) 'Prayer to Siddha' In a dignified style, the author offers salutations or prayers to Siddha soliciting shelter from him and incidentally presenting a fine discourse on Siddha, his status, his achievements, his great qualities (especially *ananta-darśana*, *-jñāna*, *-vīrya* and *-sukha*) his being the Eternal Sentient Effulgence etc All the excellences of Siddha connot be comprehended, much less can they be described, and so even to remember his name with '*bhakti*' or devotion is beneficial

[1] Here the reading *jinageho* is adopted

IX The *Ālocanā* (*Al*, verses 33) 'Recounting, Reporting or Confessing one's acts' Glorifying the great qualities of Jina, the author offers a sort of prayer, recounting, repeating or confessing his shortcomings and defaults in thoughts, words and acts, direct as well as indirect, and seeks shelter of the Jina with a view that they might be *mithyā*, null and void in effect It is a self-analysis and self-introspection in the presence of Jina who knows everything, and the purpose is to divest oneself of similar faults further and attain internal purification The mind is often perplexed and deluded, and endless defaults are there in life, and it is well-nigh impossible to expiate them It is not possible, at present, to experience self-realization Samsāra is *dvaita* and Mokṣa is *advaita* one has to reach from, one to the other The rigorous path of conduct preached by Jina is difficult in these days so devotion or *bhakti* towards Jina alone is one's rescue or shelter (30) Recitation of this *ālocanā* leads one to the abode of Bliss

X The *Sadbodha-candrodayah* (*SC*, verses 50) 'Moonrise of Real knowledge' This is an elegant exposition on the sentient Real *cit-tattva=ātmatattva*, also called *hamsa* [(*a*)*ham sa*] Though this Real is known to some, it is difficult to be described very few experience it and attain liberation Even men of learning get deluded in comprehending it it is a fact of experience where in other faculties do not function It is in oneself, but the deluded ones wander for it outside It is something unique, though in the midst of all that is commonplace Karman is different and Ātman is different this is the pure meditation whereby one gets emancipation The deluded soul has wandered long in sleep in the *samsāra*, and now it needs to be woke up by the moonrise of Real knowledge the great *yogin* is exerting himself to achieve this

XI The *Niścaya-pañcāśat* (*NP*, verses 62) 'Fifty stanzas on the Real' This is a discourse on the experience of self-realization from the Real (*niścaya*) point of view The body is ephemeral, and its contact with Ātman temporary The Ātman, however, is real and eternal, its experience, its realization is unique, sentient effulgence is beyond thoughts and words When the mind is detracted from physical and other distractions and plunged in the ocean of joy, this sentient effulgence dawns in one's experience It is rare and unique, and can be comprehended only from the Niścaya point of view wherein the three Jewels (*ratna-traya*) are realized as Ātman itself Body is different, Karman is different from Ātman this experience of isolation or separateness is important When all the distractions are eschewed, intelligence suddenly flashes into that sentient effulgence of self-realization like moon-light on the ocean when the moon rises When the distinction of *sva* and *para* is grasped, the Ātman is realized Even the ideas of 'bound' and 'liberated' presume duality, so one has to rise above them to attain self-realizaton

XII The *Brahmacarya-rakṣāvartih* (*BR*, verses 22) 'A Medicinal Wick preserving celebacy' A woman's body is full of blemishes, its allurements are deceptive, and any attachment for it is a fall for a monk who is aspiring after self-realization One should be engrossed in one's Ātman relinquishing all attachment, conquering senses and treating all women as mothers and sisters Self-restraint is possible through suitable diet etc ,[1] and

[1] Something like this verse No 4, the *Prabandhacintāmani* (Bombay 1933, p 82) puts the following verse in the mouth of Hemacandra

सिंहो बली द्विरदशूकरमांसभोजी । सवत्सरेण रतमेति किलैकवेलम् ॥
पारापत खरशिलाकणभोजनोऽपि । कामी भवत्यनुदिन वद कोऽत्र हेतु ॥

all incentive to sex-passion has to be abandoned then and thus alone human life is made fruitful by practising severe penances which, in due course, lead one to the bliss of self-realization The concluding verse explains how this *prakarana* is a veritable medicinal wick

XIII The *Rsabha-stotram* (*RS*, Prākrit verses 60) 'Prayer to Rsabha' This is a prayer offered to Rsabha, the first Tīrthakara Incidentally it covers his biographical details in their mythological setting, almost from conception to his attainment of omniscience Then are described his supernatural glories in the Samavasarana, especially the eight *prātihāryas* The *anekānta* preached by him enlightens the right path which rescues one from the misery of *samsāra* His greatness is unparalleled, his knowledge is all comprehensive, and his great qualities are beyond a poet's comprehension

XIV The *Darśana-stutih* (*DS*, Prākrit verses 34) 'A prayer (offered) at the sight of (the image of) Jina (in the temple)' Here the various direct as well as indirect effects, results or fruits of seeing Jina are described very often with striking similes

XV The *Śrutadevatā-stutih* (*SD*, verses 31) 'Praise of Śrutadevatā' When the Tīrthakara attains Kevalajñāna, his divine deep voice (*divya-dhvani*) flows out transforming itself into the various languages of the hearers, and it is this *vāṇī* that the basis of the conception of Śruta-devatā ,Śaradā etc , who is given an embodied form, called also Sarasvatī, Ambā, all-white etc Praise is offered to her who is an eternal effulgence, who bestows wisdom and poetic faculty, who shows a clear path , without whose aid life loses its purpose, who is devoted to by Ganadharas (that explain the *divya-dhvani*), who is manifest in Anga texts and who opens the outlet to the highest knowledge etc By reciting this hymn, one crosses the ocean of poetry and that of Samsāra

XVI The *Svayambhū-stutih* (*SV*, verses 24) 'Prayer to (twenty-four Tīrthakaras beginning with Svayambhū, Ādijina or Rsabha)' Each stanza is a prayer offered to one Tīrthakara in a poetic style, sometime referring to his spiritual or religious benevolence, sometime giving an etymology or explanation of his named and sometime mentioning some significant trait or event in his spiritual career

XVII The *Suprabhātāstakam* (*SA*, verses 8) 'Eight stanzas on the Blessed morning' The blessed morning has a symbolic meaning here When the night and the consequent sleep of the Ghātiyā Karmas have reached their termination, the two eyes of omniscience *jñāna* and *darśana*, open for the Jina, his omnipresent knowledge enlightens the whole universe, all perverted views are dispelled and the right path is shown to all for their spiritual benefit It is the *suprabhāta*, the dawning of omniscient blessedness, that is glorified here in a florid style

XVIII The *Śāntinātha-stotram* (*SN*, verses 9) 'Praise addressed to Śāntinātha' The last *pāda* of each verse soliciting protection or shelter is identical in all the stanzas The sixteenth Tīrthakara, Śāntinātha or the Lord of Peace, whose very name itself is alluring, is praised here with reference to Eight *prātihāryas*, more or less divine glories attending on him in his Samavasarana (i e , the supernatural theatre for preaching), namely (1) *chatra-traya*, three umbrellas (one above the other)', (2) *dundubhi*, the drum, (3) *simhāsana*, the lion-seat, (4) *puspavrsti*, shower of flowers, (5) *bhāmandala*, halo of

lustre, (6) *aśoka*, Aśoka tree, (7) *divya-dhvani*, celestial voice; and (8) *cāmara*, chowry It is the devotion or *bhakti* that tempts one to praise the greatness of Śāntinātha which is incomprehensible

XIX The *Śrī-jinapūjāṣṭakam* (*JP*, verses 10) 'Eight stanzas for offering worship to Jina' The first eight verses refer to the offering of (*i*) *jala*, water, (*ii*) *candana*, sandal paste, (*iii*) *akṣata*, a cluster of rice-particles, (*iv*) *puṣpa*, flowers, (*v*) *naivedya*, foodstuff, (*vi*) *dīpa*, waving of lighted lamp, (*vii*) *dhūpa*, incense, (*viii*) *phala*, fruits, and lastly *puṣpāñjali*, a handlful of flowers Some of the ideas are expressed with a poetic flourish and eliminating apparent contradiction in offering these items to Jineśvara who is free from *kṣudhā* etc The Arhat or Jina is *kṛta-kṛtya* and hence the *pūjā* serves no purpose of his an agriculturist cultivates the land not so much for the benefit of the king as for his own One who offers *pūjā* has his heart and mind purified

XX The *Śrī-karuṇāṣṭakam* (*KA*, verses 8) 'Eight stanzas soliciting Divine Mercy ' The suffering soul (styled here *kimkara*, *dīna*, *patita* etc), plunged in the misery of rebirth, piteously appeals to Jineśvara for rescue from Samsāra and solicits his mercy A village headman gives shelter to any one in difficulty, what wonder then that the Lord of Worlds (called here *tribhuvanaguruh*, *jagatām prabhuh*, *kāruṇikah* etc) shows kindness to the soul oppressed by Karmas! The suffering soul can be happy so long as the lotus-feet of Jina are treasured in one's heart

XXI The *Kriyā-kānda-cūlikā* (*KC*, verses 18) 'A *cūlikā*, crest, appendix or concluding recitation at the close of the routine of duties' The first nine verses constitute a devotional prayer offered to Jinendra by the author in the first person The Jinendra is a mine of virtues and free from all the blemishes howsoever great a poet might be, it is not possible for him to encompass the entire height of his virtues, still the prayer is just an attempt to express the inner devotion Devotional thoughts and prayers directed towards Jinendra achieve all the objects (*nikhilārtha-siddhi*) Devotion to the feet of Jina is the highest solicitation and the greatest benefit Study of all scriptures and practice of all conduct are not possible to-day, and hence, at present, devotion (*bhakti*) to Jina is the highest panacea, a gradual step to Moksa The feet of Jinendra are the highest shelter wherethrough one might get the three-fold jewel and be free from all evils Whatever blemishes have occurred through *pramāda* (carelessness, negligence, lack of vigilence etc) in the practice of religious virtues and whatever sin has accrued thereby, the aspirant appeals to Jina, should become null and void,[1] by his remembering the feet of the latter The Jinavānī characterised by the glow of Syādvāda and shedding light on the entire range of reality, is the supreme authority and valid means of knowledge (*pramāna*) she is like a mother who should overlook the aspirant's short-comings in the prayers offered This Cūlikā,[2] if recited thrice daily, eliminates all the blemishes in the daily routine arising out of physical, verbal and mental limitations of an individual

XXII The *Ekatvabhāvanā-daśakam* (*EB*, verses 11) 'Ten stanzas of Reflection on Oneness or Separateness' One who realizes oneself, one's own Ātman, the great effulgent

[1] These verses are of the pattern of *micchāmi dukkaḍam* and then follows a prayer to Jinavānī

[2] This *prakarana* looks like a combination of two *aṣṭakas*, and the last two verses come like an appendage perhaps added by the author himself

and sentient principle, is a great Yogin who is not afraid of Karmas and who crosses this Samsāra Thus one attains the highest Bliss of Liberation which is immune from attachment and aversion (*rāga* and *dveṣa*)

XXIII The *Paramārtha-vimśatih* (*PV*, verses 20) 'Twenty stanzas dealing with the Highest Object' In this Samsāra, that the Ātman is unique and separate from Karman (*advaita*) and also the seed of the tree of Liberation is not realized. This self-realization is characterised by infinite-quaternity (*ananta-catuṣṭaya*) and is above all worldly botherations This state of isolation is an abode of infinite knowledge, therein one's perfect independence (*ekākitā*) is realized, and therein the self is realized (*so'ham*), eschewing passions and possessions The body may be weak, the times may be bad—still nothing should come in the way of concentrating one's mind on that pure sentient spirit, leaving aside foreign adjuncts and outward attachments If the Teacher's words burn bright, giving joy, in one's heart, all other considerations are subservient When the Karmas are realized to be separate from Ātman, even the ideas of happiness and misery disappear When the mind is firm, all other distractions lose their effect, the pure sentient Ātman is realized, there is no room for any attachment or desire, and it is a state, which words cannot adequately describe

XXIV The *Śarīrāṣṭakam* (*SA*, verses 8) 'Eight stanzas on body' The human body is a hut, full of dirt and perishable by nature a sensible person should never be over attached to it and try to make it pure by water and sandal paste It is not fit for enjoyment, but it should be yoked to the practice of penances and used as a boat to cross this worldly current It should treasure the correct instructions of the Teacher Contact with this body is the veritable worldly life, so one should not go on nourishing it and be attached to it

XXV The *Snānāṣṭakam* (*Sn*, verses 8) 'Eight stanzas on bathing' The Ātman is so pure by nature that no bathing is needed for it, while the body is so impure that bathing can never purify it Real bathing consists in that sense of discrimination (*viveka*) which alone wards off the dirt of sin The real *tīrtha* is the *ratnatraya* (Right Faith, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct) in which the wise should dip themselves rather than in the stream of Ganges which cannot bestow internal purity and remove the sin This body is so impure that no amount of *tīrtha-snāna* and camphor-paste can purify it, and one day it is sure to decay So the wise should concentrate themselves on the cultivation of Samyag-darśana etc

XXVI The *Brahmacaryāṣṭakam* (*BA*, verses 9) Sex-passion is an animal instinct, so the wise people try to avoid it even in the case of their wives, then what to say with regard to other women! Sex-enjoyment is a trifle of satisfaction, and therefore, it cannot be called happiness A self-controlled monk has to avoid it fully, because it is harmful to him here and elsewhere it is a poison which allures fickle minds This is addressed to those who are aspiring after liberation, so those who are plunged in sex-pleasures should receive it with toleration

3 Padmanandi His Authorship

Among the twenty-six *prakaranas* put together under the common title *Pp*, four (XXII, XXIII, XXIV and XXVI) do not mention the name of the author, and the remaining twenty-two specify him as Padmanandi (in Prākrit Poma- or Pomma-namdi

741, 774), sometimes, for metrical necessity, giving, at times by śleṣa, the synonyms Abja-(883), Ambhoja-(514), Ambhoruha-(838, 847) and Pankaja-nandi (396, 485, 930), he is qualified by terms like *bhavya*, *muni*, *yatīndra* and *sūri* which show that he was a pious and outstanding monk, and more than once the name of his *guru* is mentioned as Vīranandi (198, indirectly 252 and 546) This is all that we know about Padmanandi from this *Pp.*

Though the four *prakaranas*, noted above, do not mention the author's name, they have much in common with others cf XXII *EB* with IV *ES*, XXII 6 and X *SC*, 49, cf XXIII *PV*, 9, 10 and 16 with III *AP*, 17, XXIII 18 with I *DA*, 55, XXIII 19 and 20 with I 54 and XI *NP*, 10, cf XXIV *SA*, 1 with III 3, XXIV 5 with III 17 etc, and cf XXVI *BA*, with XII *BR*, especially 665 and 939 Further, in XXVI *BA*, the author mentions himself as *muni* which often goes with Padmanandi in this work So even the anonymous sections have a stamp of similar contents, and are probably composed by the same author, Padmanandi

There have been many authors and saints bearing the name Padmanandi at different times and places It is easier to raise a question whether all these *prakaranas* are written by one and the same Padmanandi than to answer it, because there is no sufficient evidence, either internal or external, to tackle this problem satisfactorily It looks highly probable, though one should not be too sure, that the hand of one and the same author is apparent in all these *prakaranas* First, the name Padmanandi is mentioned at the close of most of them, and as noted above, even the anonymous ones have something strikingly common with others Secondly, there are some verses repeated or nearly repeated in different *prakaranas* for instance I 16 and VI 10, I 149 and IX 24, I 154 and XXIII 19 (the third line is differently worded), I 158 and IX 5 (some two lines alike), I 159 and IX 19, II 7 and II 42 (this is common in the same *prakarana*, thus increasing the specified number), III 3 and XXIV 1, XI 10 and XXIII 20 (partly), etc Thirdly, very similar topics, with quite parallel settings, are expounded in different *prakaranas* see, for instance, I 125 and XIII 34, II 1f and VI 1f, IV *ES* and XXII *EB*, XII 6 and XXVI 9, etc Fourthly, the author's devotion to his *guru* and his words of instruction is repeatedly mentioned in various *prakaranas*, see, for instance I 197, II 54, IX 32, X 26, 49, XI 4, 59, XXII 6, XXIII 16, etc Fifthly, the Prākrit *prakaranas* have also some ideas common between themselves and with others for instance, XIII 23f and XVIII 1f, XIII 59 and XV 31, XIII 3 and XIV 16 Lastly, there are contexts in which similes and expressions are alike, for instance, IV 61 and VII 29 So, as long as there is no positive evidence to the contrary, one may work with the hypothesis that all the *prakaranas* are composed by one and the same Padmanandi

4 VARIOUS PADMANANDIS

There have been many saints bearing the name Padmanandi, and some of them have Prākrit and Sanskrit works to their credit (*i*) Kundakunda of venerable antiquity had a name Padmanandi, and his various Prākrit works are well-known [1] (*ii*) The *Jambūdīva-pannatti*,[2] a Prākrit text on Jaina cosmography, is composed by Padmanandi who gives

[1] A N UPADHYE *Pravacanasara*, Intro pp 2 f, Bombay 1935

[2] Ed by H L JAIN AND A N UPADHYE, Sholapur 1958, see Intro pp 13 f For other discussion see also the *Indian H Quarterly* XIV, pp 188 ff, Calcutta 1938, J MUKTHAR *Purātana Jaina Vākyasūcī*, Intro pp 64 ff, Sarasawa 1950 N PREMI *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, 2nd ed, pp 256 ff, Bombay 1956

good many details about himself He was a pupil of Balanandi and a grand pupil of Vīranandi Tentatively he is assigned to the close of the 10th or to the beginning of the 11th century A D (iii) The author of the Prākrit Vrtti on the *Pañcasamgraha*, lately published by the Bhāratīya Jñānapītha (Banaras 1960), is Paumanamdi who calls himself a *muni* and who is later than Akalanka (iv) The *Dhammarasāyanam*,[1] in 193 Prākrit gāthās, is a disquisition on Dharma, and we only know that the name of the author is Padmanandi There is no evidence to fix his age (v) Padmanandi,[2] who, according to the Paṭṭāvali, succeeded Prabhācandra on the pontifical seat at Delhi (Ajmer?) is assigned to c A D 1328-1393 He came from a Brahmin family, and is the author of the *Bhāvanāpaddhati*, a hymn of 34 verses in fluent Sanskrit, and the *Jīrāpalli-Pārśvanāthastotra* He consecrated an image of Ādinātha in the year A D 1393[3] It is his pupils that occupied further three seats of Bhattārakas at Delhi-Jaipur, at Īdara and at Surat

Then turning to epigraphic records, it is possible—though there are difficulties here and there—to list and distinguish a number of Padmanandis (who are introduced with some details) from the date specified and from their teachers and colleagues mentioned

(i) Padmanandi Siddhānti-deva or -cakravarti of the Kundakundānvaya, Mūlasamgha, Krānūrgana and Tintrinīka-gaccha was present in A D 1075 at the time of a religious donation[4] (ii) Kaumāradeva-vrati, who was a grand-pupil of Gollācārya and a pupil of Traikālya-yogi, had also the well-known appellation Aviddhakarna-Padmanandi-saiddhāntika He belonged to the Deśī-gana, a sub-division of the Nandi-gana in the Mūlasamgha, and is referred to in an inscription of A D 1163 He had a colleague in Prabhācandra His disciple was Kulabhūsana who had a pupil in Māghanandi associated with Kollāpura[5] Possibly it is this Padmanandi that is referred to as *mantravādi* in an inscription of A D 1176[6] (iii) Padmanandi, a disciple of Nayakīrti and a colleague of Prabhācandra, is mentioned in some records dated A D 1181, 1195 and 1206[7] (iv) Padmanandi, a pupil of Rāv (m) anandi and a grandpupil of Vīranandi, is mentioned in an inscription of the middle of the 12th century A D[8] (v) Padmanandi-pandita was one of the two eminent pupils of Adhyātmi Śubhacandra-deva who died in A D 1313 and whose epitaph they caused to be made as an act of reverence[9] (vi) Padmanandi-Bhattāraka-deva, a pupil of Bāhubali Maladhārideva, is mentioned in a record of A D 1303 when he got a temple constructed[10] (vii) Padmanandi-deva, disciple of Traividyadeva of the Kondakundānvaya of the Pustaka-gaccha of the Deśi-gana of the Mūlasamgha, passed away in A D 1316 (? 1376)[11]

[1] Mānikacanda D Jaina Granthamālā, No 21, *Siddhāntasarādisamgrahaḥ*, pp 192 ff, Bombay 1922

[2] A N UPADHYE *Kārttikeyānuprekṣā*, Intro p 79, Agas 1960, in which some earlier sources are duly noted

[3] So this Padmanandi could not be the author of the *Ekatvasaptati* as it was once presumed

[4] *Epigraphia Carnatica* (*E C*), VIII, Sorab No 262

[5] *E C* II, ŚB, No 64 (40)

[6] Ibidem No 66 (42)

[7] Ibidem Nos 327 (124), 333 (128) and 335 (130), he too is styled *mantra-vādīśvara*, Ibidem 66 (42) Thus the personalities of Padmanandi in ii and iii seem to merge into one

[8] P B DESAI *Jainism in South India* (Sholapur 1957), pp 280 f, see also *E C*, VIII, Sorab Nos 140, 233, *Ibid*, VII, Shikarpur No 197

[9] *E C*, ŚB No 65 (41) and Intro p 86

[10] *E C*, IV, Hunsur No 14

[11] *E C*, ŚB, No 269 (114)

(*viii*) Padmanandi, pupil of Prabhācandra, is highly praised in the Deogarh inscription of A D 1414 [1]

From the meagre information that we have gleaned about our Padmanandi, it is not possible to identify him with any one of the Padmanandis, listed above, whose personalities are sufficiently distinct

5 Padmanandi His Age

It is to be seen what limits can be put to the age of Padmanandi, the author of *Pp* No internal evidence is found in these *prakaranas*

(A) Whatever external evidence is available may be noted here chronologically, as far as possible

(*i*) A Ms of the Hindī Vacanikā[2] is dated *samvat* 1915, i e , A D 1858 Then there is a Ms of *Pp*, dated *samvat* 1625, i e , 1567 A D [3]

(*ii*) Śrutasāgara (*c* 15th century A D)[4] quotes in his Sanskrit commentary[5] (*a*) on *Damsana-pāhuda* 9 and *Mokkha-pāhuda* 12 the IV *ES* 61, in the former case, with the introductory phrase *uktam ca Vīranandiśiṣyena Padmanandinā*, (*b*) on *D-pāhuda* 30, the I *DA*, 75 with the same introductory phrase, (*c*) on *Cāritta-p* 21, a verse found at I *DA*, 16 and VI *US*, 10, (*d*) on *Bodha-p* 10, 23 and 50 (also on *Mokkha-p* 9), the VII *DV*, 22, X *SC*, 31 and IV *ES* 79, in the first two instances with the above introductory phrase, (*e*) on *Mokkha-p* 55, the IV *ES*, 53[6] with a remark *tathā coktam Ekatva-saptatyām* So Śrutasāgara knows very well some *prakaranas* from *Pp* and attributes them (I, IV, VI, VII and X) to Padmanandi, the pupil of Vīranandi

(*iii*) Āśādhara, a voluminous author, whose known dates are A D 1228-1243, quotes in his *svopajña* commentary on the (*Anagāra*) *Dharmāmrta*[7] (a) VIII, 21, 23 and 64, the X *SC*, 1, 18-16-44 and VI US, 61, (*b*) IX, 80-1, 93 and 97, the I *DA*, 41, 42 and 43, once attributing the quotation to Śrī-Padmanandipāda Thus Āśādhara is acquainted with Padmanandi and some of his *prakaranas*

(*iv*) Prabhācandra, in his Sanskrit commentary on the *Ratnakarandaka-śrāvakācāra* IV, 18, quotes two verses, Nos 43-44, from VI, *US*, of Padmanandi, and he flourished earlier than (Āśādhara) [8]

(*v*) Padmaprabha Maladhārideva has written a Sanskrit commentary on the *Niyama-sāra* (ed Bombay 1916) of Kundakunda in which he quotes IV *ES*, 14, 20, 39-40-41 and 79 while explaining the gāthās Nos 55, 96, 100 and 46 (of the *Niyama*) respectively, usually

[1] R Mitra JASB, LII, pp 67-80

[2] For details about it, see the Hindi Introduction

[3] K Kasaliwal *Rājasthāna ke Jaina Śāstra Bhandārokī Grantha-sūcī*, II, p 395, Jaipur 1954

[4] A N Upadhye *Kārttikeyānuprekṣā* (Agas 1960), Intro p 85

[5] Māṇikacandra D J Granthamālā, No 17, Bombay 1920

[6] This verse is absent in the Kannada Mss

[7] Premi *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, (Bombay 1956), pp 342f

[8] Māṇikacandra D J Granthamālā, 24, Bombay 1925 its Intro, also pp 53 f. See also the *Ātmānuśāsana*, Intro , Sholapur 1961

mentioning the *ES* It is known now that he died on February 24, 1185 A D [1] So Padmanandi, the author of *ES*, flourished earlier than Padmaprabha, whose literary activities might be, broadly speaking, assigned to the middle of the 12th century A D.

(*vi*) Jayasena, in his Sanskrit commentary on the *Pañcāstikāya* (ed. Bombay 1915), gāthā No 162, quotes the verse No 14 of IV *ES* without specifying the source Jayasena's commentary is later than the *Ācārasāra* of Vīranandi (who completed the *svopajña* Kannaḍa commentary on it in 1153 A D) but earlier than the Sanskrit commentary on the *Niyamasāra* by Padmaprabha (died in 1185 A D) who appears to have followed Jayasena's commentary on the *Pravacanasāra* II 46 in his commentary on the *Niyamasāra* 32 [2]

Padmanandi is a well-read author, and naturally some of his verses remind us of the thoughts and expressions from earlier works of Kundakunda, Pūjyapāda and others If the subject matter is of a dogmatical nature, this inheritance of ideas has not much chronological value, but if, otherwise, the ideas and expressions have a striking similarity, some influence or inheritance can be presumed

(*B*) Whatever parallel thoughts and expressions are detected in the works of earlier authors are noted below chronologically, as far as possible

(*i*) Pūjyapāda's Sanskrit *Bhaktis* are well-known, and Padmanandi's V *YB*, 6 reminds one of the *Yogi-bhakti* 3, ff , also *kṣepaka* No 2 [3]

(*ii*) The *Bhaktāmara-stotra* (*BS*) of Mānatunga[4] is a fine piece of poetry, besides being a devotional hymn, and is often recited by Jaina monks and laymen Some of the verses of Padmanandi remind one of the BS cf XXI *KC*, 1 and BS, 27 XIII *RS*, 23-34, XVIII *SN*, 1-8 (the description of the eight *prātihāryas*) and BS 28-35, compare also XIII *RS*, 8, 28 and 51 with BS 22, 32 and 24-5.

(*iii*) Some verses of Padmanandi recall to one's mind similar contexts from the *Kalyāṇamandira-stotra* (KS)[5] of Kumudacandra cf XIII *RS*, 24 with KS 19, also XV *ŚD*, 31 and XVIII *SN* 1-2 with KS 2, 25-6

(*iv*) The *Ātmānuśāsana* (Ā) of Gunabhadra[6] is a didactic anthology with fine specimens of religious and ascetic poetry in the pattern of Jaina ideology, and with it some of the *prakaranas* of Padmanandi have common topics Now and then Padmanandi's verses resemble those of Ā compare, for instance, I *DA*, 76 and Ā 15, I *DA* (also III *AP*, 34) and Ā 130, III *AP*, 44 and Ā 34, XII *BR*, 21 and Ā 111 Gunabhadra is assigned to the middle of the 9th century A D [7]

[1] A N UPADHYE Padmaprabha and his commentary on the *Niyamasāra* in the *J of the University of Bombay*, XI, ii, 1942, P B DESAI *Jainism in South India and Some Jaina Epigraphs* (Sholapur 1957), pp 159-60

[2] A N UPADHYE *Pravacanasāra* (Bombay 1935), Intro p 104, K SHASTRI *Jaina Sandeśa*, Śodhānka 5, p 181, Mathura 1959 It is found in a new edition of the *Niyamasārā* (Songad 1951) that the portion resembling Jayasena s commentary is omitted

[3] J PARSHWANATH, Sholapur 1921, pp 192 f , 198

[4] Kāvyamālā, VII, 4th ed , Bombay 1926, H JACOBI, *Ind Studien*, XIV, p 359 ff, M WINTERNITZ *A History of Indian Lit* , II, p 549

[5] Kāvyamālā VII, 4th ed , Bombay 1926, H JACOBI, *Ind Studien* XIV, p 376 ff , M WINTERNITZ *A History of Indian Lit* , II, p 551

[6] N S. Press, Bombay 1905, in the Sanātana-Jaina-Granthamālā I

[7] PREMI *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, 2nd ed , (Bombay 1956), pp. 138 ff ; also Intro to the *Ātmānuśāsana*, Sholapur 1961

(*v*) Somadeva was an outstanding saint and poet of his age, and his *Yaśastilaka* (Y) has influenced many subsequent Sanskrit authors Padmanandi shows close acquaintance with this religious romance and seems to be indebted to it here and there compare, for instance, XV *ŚD*, 15 and Y Uttara, p 401 (the verse *ekam padam* etc) Padmanandi's exposition of *dāna* (VII *DV*, 11-12), his arguments to prove the next world (I *DA*, 27) his enumeration of the six duties of laymen (VI, *US*, 7) his reference to the *śāka-piṇḍa* (II *DU*, 7) given to a monk, and his mention of eight *mūla-guṇas* remind us of similar contexts in Y Uttara pp 403-4, p 257 (the verse *tadarhajas* etc), p 414, p 408, p 327 etc We may compare also VI *US*, 26 with the verse *sarva eva hi* etc, in Y Uttara p 373 Somadeva completed his Y in Śaka 881, i.e., 959 A D

(*vi*) The *Jñānārṇava* (*Jñ*) of Śubhacandra contains a good deal of religious poetry especially in the exposition of *anuprekṣā* and *dhyāna* The III *AP* has some similes common with *anitya-a*, and some verses of Padmanandi remind one of Jñ compare, for instance, III *AP*, 16, 28, 50 with Jñ, *anitya-a* 30-31 (this is an old simile found also in the *Bhagavatī Ārādhanā*, gāthā No 1720, of Sivārya), *aśaraṇa-a* 8

(*vii*) The high ecstatic and spiritual flourishes seen here and there in the poetry of Padmanandi often remind one of the style of Amṛtacandra The verse No 8 ff of XI *NP* can be compared with the *Puruṣārthasiddyupāya* (PS)[2] 4-6 Amṛtacandra flourished earlier than A D 998, that being the date of the composition of the *Dharmaratnākara* of Jayasena who has drawn on the PS of Amṛtacandra[3]

(*viii*) In a few contexts, the ideas and expressions of Padmanandi have close resemblance with those in some of the works of Amitagati (II) compare, for instance, I *DA* 134 ff and *Śrāvakācāra*[4] IV, 46, VI *US*, 29-30 and *Śrā* XIII, 44-48, see also XXI *KC* 11 and *Dvātriṁśikā*[5] 5-7, in both the places there is an appeal to Sarasvatī for forgiveness Amitagati flourished in the last quarter of the 10th and 1st quarter of the 11th century A D[6]

(*ix*) Padmanandi has repeatedly appealed for the construction of temples and statues of Jina, and one of his verses, VII *DV*, 22, very much resembles Vasunandi's *Śrāvakācāra*[7] 481-82, with which he appears to share some contexts as well Vasunandi flourished earlier than Āśādhara[8]

[1] Kāvyamālā, 70, Pūrva- and Uttara-Khanda, Bombay 1903, also K K HANDIQUI *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, Sholapur 1949

[2] N S Press, Bombay 1905, in the Sanātana-Jaina-Granthamālā I

[3] A N UPADHYE *Pravacanasāra*, Intro, pp 100-101, also PARAMANAND *Anekānta*, VIII pp 173-75

[4] Muni Śrī-Anantakīrti D J Granthamālā 2, Bombay Samvat 1979

[5] Māṇikacandra D J Granthamālā, 13, Bombay, 1928

[6] A N UPADHYE *Paramātma-prakāśa* (Bombay 1937), Intro, p 37, footnote 3, for more details about Amitagati see N PREMI *Jaina Sahitya aur Itihāsa* (2nd ed.), pp 275 ff Bombay 1956

[7] Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, Banaras 1952

[8] A N UPADHYE 'On the Date of Vasunandi's com on Mūlācāra' in *Woolner commemoration Volume* (Lahore 1940), pp 257-60, J MUKTHAR *Purātana Jaina Vākyasūcī* (Sarsawa 1950) Intro pp 99-101

Padmanandi does not mention any of these authors or their works by name from which some influence on him is detected on account of similar thoughts or expressions So the chronological limits based on these similarities are only a matter of probability

From the above discussion all that can be said is that it is highly probable that Padmanandi is later than Amitagati (last quarter of the 10th and the first quarter of the 11th century A D) and definitely earlier than Padmaprabha (who died in 1185 A D)

(C) There is a Kannada commentary available on the *Ekatvasaptati* [1] It exhibits a good philosophical style, rendered a bit heavy with Sanskrit compounds and long expressions It contains a number of quotations in Prākrit and Sanskrit, drawn from the works of Kundakunda and Amrtacandra It is written in the third-person style As mentioned in it, the name of the commentator is (Śrī) Padmanandi-vrati, and the name of the author is Padmanandi-muni, they were contemporaries, no doubt, and one feels like starting with the presumption (a presumption, because the *Pp* does not mention Śubhacandra and Kanakanandi and *ES* and its commentary make no reference to Vīranandi, among his Gurus) that they are identical That is, the author himself has written the Kannada commentary,[2] and this seems to have been hinted by the phrase *labdhātma-vṛtti* About

[1] Some 50 verses of this, along with a Sanskrit com , were published in the *Kāvyāmbudhi*, ed , by PADMARAJ PANDIT as early as 1893 Besides this Dr UPADHYE has scrutinised three Mss for this Kannada commentary (i) It is a plam-leaf Ms from the Lakṣmīsena Maṭha, Kolhapur It contains four works, *Iṣṭopadeśa*, *Samādhi-śataka*, *Svarūpasambodhana* and *Ekatvasaptati*, all accompanied by Kannaḍa commentaries of different authors (ii) There is a Ms at Arrah, and Pt K BHUJABALI sent to Dr UPADHYE some notes from it (iii) Another palm-leaf Ms was lent to Dr UPADHYE by the late lamented Pt APPASHASTRI of Udgaon (Dist Kolhapur) The following observations are based on these sources

[2] This commentary deserves to be well-edited and brought to light Selecting suitable readings and making minor corrections (though some difficulties of interpretation remain) I am presenting some relevant extracts from it on which these observations are based The opening portion runs thus आनम्यानन्दचैतन्यसहजात्मानमक्षयम् । कर्णाटभाषया वक्ष्ये टीकामेकत्वसप्तते श्रीमत्पद्मनंदिपण्डितदेवरत्यासन्नाशेषभव्यजनंगळ्गे बहिस्तत्त्वशुद्धातत्तत्त्वगळं गौणवृत्तियि शुद्धांतस्तत्त्वपरमतत्त्वमं मुख्यवृत्तियिं प्रतिपादिसिवुदुकारणमागि एकत्वसप्ततियंब प्रथदमोदलोळ् इष्टदेवतानमस्कारमं मंगळार्थमागि माडिदपर् । अदावुदेंदोडे—चिदन्वैकसद्भावं etc Then the concluding portion runs thus

श्रीपद्मनन्दिव्रतिनिर्मितेयम् , एकत्वसप्तत्यखिलार्थपूर्ति ।
वृत्ती रं निम्बनृपप्रबोधलब्धात्मवृत्तिर्जयतां जगत्याम् ॥

स्वस्ति श्री-शुभचन्द्रराद्धान्तदेवाग्रशिष्येण कनकनन्दिपण्डितघर्मरश्मिविकसितहृत्कुमुदानन्द श्रीमद्-अमृतचन्द्रचन्द्रिकोन्मीलितनेत्रोत्पलावलोकिताशेषाध्यात्मतत्त्ववेदिना पद्मनन्दिमुनिना श्रीमज्जैनसुधाब्धिवर्धनकरपूर्णेन्दुरारातिवीरश्रीपतिनिम्बराजावबोधनाया कृतैकत्वसप्ततेर्वृत्तिरियम्-तज्ज्ञा संप्रवदन्ति संततमिह श्रीपद्मनन्दिव्रती, कामध्वंसक इत्यलं तदनृतं तेषां वचस्सर्वथा । वाण्या सार्धमहर्निशं रणति संप्रोत्या तव कामिणीम् , आलिङ्ग्यमलकीर्तिवारवनितां वाञ्छन् यदा तिष्ठति ॥ श्रीमन्निम्बनृसिंहवृंहितरभवत्समामभीमारवोदीर्णोदीर्णभयात् पुरत्रयहर स्थाणुर्दिशादन्तिनः । शेषा दन्तिन एव भीतमतयो जाता यदि स्थीयते, किं वीरारिनृपैः पुनस्तव रणे सामन्तचूडामणि (?) ॥ निम्बस्तम्बेरमस्तद्गुलवदरिनृपस्तम्भवीराबमर्दी, सद्वंशोऽनूनदानाद्भुतभुवनतलश्यामभावैकरम्य । भद्रो भद्रप्रतीक प्रबलतरकराघातभीताखिलाशापाल प्रत्यर्थिसेवामथनपृथुयशोऽयासदिक्चक्रवाळ ॥ This last verse is not found in the Arrah Ms

Padmanandi-muni, it is said in the commentary that he was the chief disciple (*agra-śiṣya*) of Śubhacandra-rāddhāntadeva, that he had received instructions from Kanakanandi Paṇḍita, that he got spiritual enlightenment through the moonlight (of the words) of Amṛtacandra, and that he composed this *Ekatvasaptati* for the instruction of Nimbarāja Both Padmanandi and Nimbarāja are glorified in the concluding verses

These details, as they are contemporary, have a great value for fixing the date of the author of *ES*, in particular, and of our author in general Padmanandi might be having more than one *guru*, so it can be accepted that both Vīranandi and Śubhacandra were the *gurus* of Padmanandi R NARASIMHACHAR[1] perhaps did not distinguish between the text and the commentary of *ES*, that is why he observed that Nimba was praised as the crest-jewel of *sāmantas* in the *ES* His second observation is that Padmanandi was a disciple of Śubhacandra who died in 1123 A D This is not unlikely, but there is no positive proof that this very Śubhacandra was the *guru* of Padmanandi The inscription[2] describing the glorious personality and recording the death of Śubhacandra has no reference at all, as far as seen, to Padmanandi The commentary calls Śubhacandra by the designation *rāddhānta-deva* and the inscription also describes him *Jaina-mārga-rāddhānta-payodhi* in addition to *siddhānta-vārinidhi* but that is a slender common point More definite proof is needed, because, according to the inscription, some other contemporary teachers of the name Śubhacandra[3] were there

Padmanandi was a contemporary of Nimbadeva[4] Nimbadeva was a *mahāsāmanta*, a great feudatory, of the Śilāhāra king Gandarāditya, he was a devout lay disciple of Māghanandi (styled as *Kollāpure tīrthakṛt*), he got constructed the Rūpanārāyanabasadi (*rūpa-nārāyana* being the title of his master Gandarāditya) in Kolhapur, and he made a grant on Kartika va 5, Śaka 1058 (A D 1136) of some income (levied from merchants etc , from places round about Kolhapur and Miraj which seem to have been under him) to another temple (built by himself) dedicated to Pārśvanātha in the market site of Kavadegolla This may be the same as the present day Mānastambha Basadi near the Sukravāra gate Nimbadeva was a devout Jaina Inscriptions speak of him as the reservoir of many good qualities and a *kalpa-vṛkṣa* to the learned *yatis* This means that our Padmanandi being a contemporary of Nimbadeva flourished near about A D 1136, i e , in the second quarter of the 12th century A D[5]

[1] *E C* , II, SB, Intro , p 68

[2] Ibidem No 117 (43), Intro , p 82

[3] Ibidem No 380, also A N UPADHYE Śubhacandra and his Prākrit Grammar, *Annals of the B O R I* , XIII, i, pp 37 ff

[4] Major GRAHAM *Report* on the Principality of Kolhapur, pp 357, 465, 466 etc , *E C* II ŚB, Nos 64 (40), Intro , pp 61, 74 and 85, P B DESAI *Jainism in South India* etc , (Sholapur 1957), p 120

[5] This is a partial fulfilment of the promise of a paper on Nimbadeva made by Dr UPADHYE years back *Annals* of the *B O R I* , XIII, i, p 40 Nimba Sāmanta was such an outstanding figure of his age that subsequent generations invested his personality almost with a legendary halo There is available in Kannaḍa a work *Nimba-sāvanta-carite* In 1931 Prof UPADHYE came across a Ms of it in the possession of the late lamented Pt APPASHASTRI UDAGAONKAR who kindly loaned it to him for some time and Prof K G KUNDANGAR prepared a neat transcript of it which is still with him Prof KUNDANGAR wrote also a note on this work in the *Jinavijaya* (Kannaḍa), August 1931 Pt APPASHASTRI's Ms is written in A D 1736, at Ashta (Dist Sangli), following a Ms there in the temple of Ajitanātha This Ms was got prepared by the nun (*kamti*) Śāntimati, the disciple of Guṇabhadra who seems to have

To conclude, Padmanandi is possibly later than Amitagati, definitely earlier than Padmaprabha (who died in 1185 A D) and a contemporary of Nimbadeva (known date 1136 A D.) So we can assign Padmanandi to the 2nd quarter of the 12th century A D

6 PADMANANDI HIS PERSONALITY

After presenting the above study, it is possible now to get a broad outline of the personality of Padmanandi Padmanandi lived in the then Kannada speaking area and flourished during the middle of the 12th century A D He claimed among his *gurus*, Vīranandi[1] and Śubhacandra, he received instructions from Kanakanandi-pandita,[2] and he had studied well the *ādhyātmika* works of Amrtacandra He shows extensive learning, and is thoroughly grounded in the works of Kundakunda, Pūjyapāda, Gunabhadra, Somadeva and others He has equal mastery on Sanskrit, Prākrit[3] and Kannada Among his

been initiated in the order (?) by Śri-Jinasena-Bhaṭṭāraka of Kolhapur The name of the author of this *Nimba-sāvanta-carite* is Pārśva (= Pārśva) who calls himself a *satkavi* and *bhrtya* (a follower) of Jinasena of the Senagana (i e , the Bhaṭṭāraka at Kolhapur) The author does not mention when he lived He is earlier than 1736 A D , that being the date of the Ms and Prof KUNDANGAR surmises from the language and style that the author flourished in the 17th century His work might have been based on some earlier *prabandhas* or persistent traditions The work has five Samdhis and there are 506 verses in *satpadi* metre In this work, Nimbadeva is sketched as highly pious and religious, a devout Jaina, a patron of Jaina monks and Ācāryas, and very much loved and liked by the common people Bijjana of Kalyāna (who followed Jainism) once heard about the great fame of Gaṇḍarādityadeva and marched against him with his army Nimbadeva, on behalf of his master Gaṇḍarāditya, faced him on the battle field, fought bravely and routed the army, but at last was crushed by the elephant of Bijjana Bijjaṇa was overpowered by the fear that how many more such brave generals might be there under Gaṇḍarāditya and returned to Kalyāna with his army next day, without further continuing the battle This is the substance of the biography Prof KUNDANGAR has already pointed some historical discrepancy in the above details The Śilāhāra Gandarāditya was a contemporary of Chālukya Vikramāditya Tribhuvanamalladeva (1076-1126) and his sister Candrikādevi was married to the latter He ruled from 1110 to 1136 Bijjala's attack against the Chālukyas is to be assigned to 1157, so the march was against the Śilāhāra king Bhoja, and not against Gaṇḍarāditya Nimba built at least two tempels of Jina in Kolhapur, he was a devout disciple of Māghanandi, an outstanding teacher of his times, a spiritualistic text like the *Ekatvasaptati* was explained to him in Kannada, he made arrangements for pious donations, and the concluding verses of the comm of the *ES* depict him as a great hero All these must have lingered in public memory in the area round about Kolhapur and Miraj for a long time with the result that a poet like Pārsva was tempted to write a *prabandha* on Nimbadeva Dr UPADHYE is very thankful to his friend Prof K G KUNDANGAR who spared his transcript, which, at his request, he had prepared some thirty years back There was an idea of publishing it, but the text in this only available Ms is full of mistakes When some more Mss are discovered, it would be possible to present a readable text The original Ms is now in the Gurukula Library, Bahubali (Dt Kolhapur), and Prof KUNDANGAR has presented his transcript to the Karnatak University Library, Dharwar

[1] Viranandi, the author of *Ācārasāra*, wrote a Kannada vrtti on it in 1153 A D See the Intro to the *Pravacanasāra*, p 104

[2] It is not very clear whether this instruction was oral or through books Without going into the details about various Kanakanandis, it may be just noted here that Padmanandi had a contemporary Kanakanandi-paṇḍita-deva (mentioned in the Terdal inscription of 1123 A D see *I A* , XIV, pp 14-26) who was an *agra-śisya* of Māghanandi who had his royal disciple in Nimbadeva (*E C* , II, ŚB No 64 (40), also Intro p 85) for whom the *ES* and its Kannada commentary were composed

[3] Some casual observations may be added here on the Prākrit dialect used by Padmanandi in his two *prakaranas*, namely, XIII *RS* and XIV *JS* As a rule, intervocalic *k, g, c, j, t* and *d* are dropped leaving behind a vowel, which, if it is *a* or *ā* is substituted by *ya* or *yā* (*śruti*) irrespective of the preceding vowel In words like *go-caram, kamtha-gaya-jīviyassa* (XIV 18, 31) the consonants *g, c* and *j*

prakaranas, the *Ekatva-saptati* reached great eminence (and was quoted by a younger contemporary like Padmaprabha) not only by its lofty tone of spiritual contents but also by its being composed and commented upon for the instruction of Nimba Sāmanta, the great feudatory of Śilāhāras He calls himself a *vratin*, *sūri*, *muni* and *yatīndra* indicating that he was an outstanding monk He holds the instructions of his *guru* in high esteem (see I 197, II 54, IX, 32, X 26, 49, 4, 59, XXII 6, XXIII 16) He stands for rigorous practice of the basic ascetic virtues (I 40), and as a Digambara he laid great stress on self-restraint (*samyama*) and celibacy The Vyavahāra point of view is for the less intelligent, and he has insisted on the *niścāya* point of view He preferred loneliness and shows unlimited zeal for the experience and realization of the Paramātman, the eternal sentient effulgence and bliss More than once he has hinted that times are bad (VI 6, VII 27 etc) for high religious ideals and that there is slackness He repeatedly preaches that the institutions of temple, worship, consecration of images and sustenance of monks are a social obligation for the layman (VII 21) The contemporary environments not being quite favourable for *jñāna* and *cāritra*, he prefers to lay more stress on *bhakti* (IX 30, XXI 6, etc), almost of the theistic pattern (XX) He is well-read in Jaina dogmatics, and in that frame-work, he has even harnessed the Vedāntic terminology and Bhakti cult (VIII, IX, XX, XXI and XXIII etc) He is a poet of no mean order, and some of the spiritual contexts are expressed by him with remarkable ease, facility and dignity (XXIII) He is a saint of meditative mood, more inward than outward in his religious approach There are certain contexts in these *prakaranas* which rank him with Bhartrhari, Gunabhadra, Śubhacandra, Amrtacandra and other religio-didactic poets of the middle ages

7 *Pp*—The Sanskrit Commentary

The anonymous Sanskrit commentary, printed along with the text in the present edition, is more a prosaic performance, perhaps of a novice (having Hindī as his mother tongue) who has put down his jottings in his attempt to understand the text of *Pp*, than a studied exposition explaining the text in a thorough manner It is seen that minor details are explained with synonyms and real difficulties are passed over silently, and in some places even the explanations are far from satisfactory

The Sanskrit expression of the commentary is loose about gender and agreement and mixed with Hindī sentences and words in some places (IV 12 etc) We come across

are not necessarily intervocalic Then intervocalic *kh*, *gh*, *th*, *dh*, *ph* and *bh* are changed to *h* Only *n* is used initially, medially, and in a conjunct group There are no instances here of intervocalic *t* changing to *d* or of *d* retained The 3rd p sing terminations of the present and imperative are respectively *-i* and *-u* (and nowhere *di* and *du*) Gerund is seen with *-ūna* Sometimes the Ātmanepada of the Sanskrit is inherited and strong Sanskrit influence is seen in forms and compound expressions For *-a* nouns Abl terminations are *-hi* in sing and *-himto* in pl , Loc terminations are *-e* and *-mmi* in sing Some Desī words and roots like *thaga*, *nesara* and *jode* (XIII 50, 60 and 51) are used On the whole, the dialect should be called Māhārāṣṭrī with *va-śruti*, common to Jaina Mss By way of contrast, it may also be noted that in the dialect of the *Jambūdīva-pannatti-samgaho* (Sholapur 1958) of Paumanamdi there is a greater tendency towards softening of *t* to *d* and of retaining *d*, and this affects the declensional and verbal forms in various ways Then the dialect of the *Dhammarasāyanam* (Bombay 1922) of Paumanamdi comes nearer that of the two *prakaranas*, but it shows forms like *dhammādo* (13), *khādamti* (34) *sigadāe* 43), *jādo* (104), *dhuda-kammā* (189) etc , which would be foreign in style in the hymns of Padmanandi Some of these texts are not critically edited, so no conclusion can be reached at present

many forms, obviously wrong but often reflecting the pattern of the New Indo-Aryan for instance, *aṣṭāvımśatayah* for *astāvımśatıh*, *sarvam dharmam* for *sarvo dharmah* (I 38), *kana-tıṣthanena* (I 67), *durjayah durjītah* (I 99), *stūyamānesu stutyamāneṣu* (I 106), *vathınena prāpyate* (I 166) *ka āścaryah* for *kım āścaryam* (III 2), *pramuktvā* for *pramucya* (XIII 39), etc His Sanskrit renderings of Prākrit words are often incorrect for illustration, *amhārısāna mama sadrśānām*, *hıyaıcchıyā hrdayasthıtā* (XIII 5), *jıyāna yāvatām* (Ibid 21), *ccıya arcya pūjya* (Ibid 19, 33), etc This being the only available commentary it was thought advisable to put it in print along with the text

---

१ पद्मनन्दि - पञ्चविंशति की प्रतियोंका परिचय

हस्तलिखित प्रतियां—प्रस्तुत सस्करण निम्न हस्तलिखित प्रतियोंके आधारसे तैयार किया गया है।

१ 'क' प्रति-यह संस्कृत टीकासे युक्त प्रति स्थानीय श्राविकाश्रमकी संचालिका श्री ब्र सुमतीबाई शहाके संग्रह की है जो सम्भवत भट्टारक श्री लक्ष्मीसेनजी कोल्हापुरकी हस्तलिखित प्रतिपरसे तैयार की गई थी। प्रस्तुत संस्करणके लिये प्रथम कापी इसी परसे तैयार की गई थी।

२ 'श' प्रति—यह प्रति स्थानीय विद्वान् श्री पं जिनदासजी शास्त्रीकी है। इसकी लंबाई १३ इंच और चौडाई ५-१/२ इच है। पत्रसंख्या १-१७८ है। इसके प्रत्येक पत्रमें एक ओर लगभग १०-११ पक्तियां और प्रति पंक्तिमें लगभग ४४-४५ अक्षर हैं। इसमें मूल श्लोक लाल स्याहीसे तथा संस्कृत टीका काली स्याहीसे लिखी गई है। इस प्रतिमें कहीं कहीं पीछेसे किसीके द्वारा सशोधन किया गया है। इससे उसका मूल पाठ इतना भ्रष्ट हो गया है कि वह अपने यथार्थ स्वरूपमें पढा भी नहीं जाता है। इसमें ग्रन्थका प्रारम्भ ॥ ॐ नम सिद्धेभ्य ॥ इस मंगलवाक्यसे किया गया है। अन्तमें सामाप्तिसूचक निम्न वाक्य है—

॥ इति ब्रह्मचर्याष्टकं ॥ इति श्रीमत्पद्मनंद्याचार्यविरचिता पद्मनंदिपंचविशति ॥ श्रीवीतरागार्पण-मस्तु ॥ श्रीजिनाय नम ॥

प्रतिके प्रारम्भमें उसके दानका उल्लेख निम्न प्रकारसे किया गया है—श्री पद्मनंदिपंचविंशति सटीक दोशी रतनबाई कोम नेमचंद न्याहालचंद ए श्रावक पासु गोपाल फडकुलेन दान कर्यूं छे सवत् १९५१ फागण वद ११ गुरुवार।

३ 'ब' प्रति—यह प्रति सम्भवत स्व श्री पं नाथूरामजी प्रेमी बम्बई की रही है। इसकी लंबाई ११-१/२ और चौडाई ५-१/२ इंच है। पत्रसंख्या १-१७५ है। इसके प्रत्येक पत्रमें एक ओर १२ पक्तियां और प्रतिपंक्तिमें ३५-३८ अक्षर है। ग्रन्थका प्रारम्भ ॥ ॐ नम सिद्धेभ्य ॥ इस वाक्यसे किया गया है। अन्तिम समाप्तिसूचक वाक्य है—

ब्रह्मचर्याष्टकं समाप्त इति पद्मनंदिकुंदकुंदाचार्यविरचित्तं संपूर्णं ॥

इसमें 'युवतिसगविवर्जनमष्टकं' आदी इस अन्तिम श्लोक और उसकी टीकाको किसी दूसरे लेखकके द्वारा छोटे अक्षरोंमें १७५वें पत्रके नीचे लिखा गया है। इससे पूर्वके श्लोकका 'भुक्तवतः कुशलं न अस्ति' इतना टीकांश भी यहांपर लिखा गया है। उपर्युक्त समाप्तिसूचक वाक्य भी यहींपर लिखा उपलब्ध होता है। इससे यह अनुमान होता है कि सम्भवत उसका अन्तिम पत्र नष्ट हो गया

था और इसीलिये उपर्युक्त अन्तिम अंशको किसीने दूसरी प्रतिके आधारसे १७५वे पत्रके नीचे लिख दिया है। आश्चर्य नहीं जो उस अन्तिम पत्रपर लेखकके नाम, स्थान और लेखनकालका भी निर्देश रहा हो। इस प्रतिका कागज इतना जीर्ण शीर्ण हो गया है कि उसके पत्रको उठाना और रखना भी कठिन हो गया है। वैसे तो इसके प्राय सब ही पत्र कुछ न कुछ खंडित हैं, फिर भी ४० से १२६ पत्र त बहुत त्रुटित हुए हैं। इसीलिये पाठभेद देनेमें उसका बहुत कम उपयोग हो सका है।

४ 'ब' प्रति—इस प्रतिमें ग्रन्थका मूल भाग मात्र है, संस्कृत टीका नहीं है। यह ऐ. पन्नालाल सरस्वती भवन बम्बईसे प्राप्त हुई थी जो यहा बहुत थोड़े समय रह सकी है। उसका उपयोग पाठभेदोंमें क्वचित् ही किया जा सका है।

५ 'च' प्रति—यह प्रति सघके ही पुस्तकालयकी है। इसमें मूल श्लोकोंके साथ हिन्दी (ढूढारी) वचनिका है। सस्कृत टीका इसमें नहीं है। इसकी लंबाई—चौडाई १३×७ है। पत्र सख्या १—२७९ है। इसके प्रत्येक पत्रमें एक ओर १२ पंक्तियां और प्रतिपंक्तिमें ४०-४४ अक्षर हैं। लिपि सुन्दर व सुवाच्य है। इसका प्रारम्भ इस प्रकार है—॥६०॥ ॐ नम सिद्धेभ्य ॥ अथ पद्मनदिपंचविंशतिका ग्रन्थकी मूल श्लोकनिका अर्थसहित वचनिका लिखिये है॥ अन्तमें—॥ इति श्री पद्मनदिमुनिराजविरचित-पद्मनदिपचविंशतिका वचनिका समाप्त ॥ इस वाक्यको लिखकर प्रतिके लेखनकालका उल्लेख इस प्रकार किया गया है—मिति भादो वदि ॥ ३ ॥ बुधवासरे ॥ संवत ॥ १९ ॥ २९ ॥ मुराम चद्रापुरीमध्ये ॥ सुभ भवतु मंगलं ददातु ॥ श्री ॥ श्री ॥ श्री ॥

वचनिकाके अन्तमें २५ चौपाई छन्दोंमें उसके लिखने आदिका परिचय इस प्रकार कराया गया है—ढूढाहर देशमें जयपुर नगर है। उसमें रामसिंहराजा प्रजाका पालन करता था। वहा सागानेर बजारमें खिन्दूकाका मन्दिर है। वहां साधर्मी जन आकर धर्मचरचा किया करते थे। पद्मनन्दिपञ्च-विंशतिके अर्थको सुनकर उनके मनमें सर्वसाधारणके हितकी दृष्टिसे वचनिकाका भाव उदित हुआ। इसके लिये उन सबने ज्ञानचन्दके पुत्र जौहरीलालसे कहा। तदनुसार उन्होंने उसे मूल वाक्योंको सुधार कर लिखा और वचनिका लिखना प्रारम्भ कर दी। किन्तु 'सिद्धस्तुति' तक वचनिका लिखनेके पश्चात् उनका देहावसान हो गया। तब पंचोंके आग्रहसे उसे हरिचन्दके पुत्र मन्नालालने पूरा किया। इस प्रकार वचनिका लिखनेका निमित्त बतलाकर आगे उसके पचीस अधिकारोंका चौपाई छन्दोंमें ही निर्देश किया गया है। यह देश वचनिका १९१५वें सालमें मृगशिर कृष्णा ५ गुरुवारको पूर्ण हुई।

इसमे प्रथमत मूल श्लोकको लिखकर उसका शब्दार्थ लिखा गया है, और तत्पश्चात भावार्थ लिखा गया है। भावार्थमें कई स्थानोपर ग्रन्थान्तरोंके श्लोक व गाथाओं आदिको भी उद्धृत किया गया है।

मुद्रित प्रतियां—१ प्रस्तुत ग्रन्थका एक सस्करण श्री गांधी महालचन्द वस्तूरचन्दजी धाराशिवके द्वारा शक स १८२० में प्रकाशित किया गया था। इसमें मूल श्लोकके बाद उसका मराठी पद्यानुवाद, फिर सक्षिप्त मराठी अर्थ और तत्पश्चात् सक्षिप्त हिन्दी (हिन्दुस्थानी) अर्थ भी दिया गया है। हिन्दी अर्थ प्राय मराठी अर्थका शब्दश अनुवाद प्रतीत होता है। अर्थमें मात्र भावपर ही दृष्टि रखी गई है।

२ दूसरा सस्करण श्री प गजाधरलालजी न्यायशास्त्रीकी हिन्दी टीकाके साथ 'भारती भवन' बनारससे सन् १९१४ में प्रकाशित हुआ है। यह हिन्दी टीका प्राय पूर्वोक्त (५ 'च' प्रति) हिन्दी वचनिकाका अनुकरण करती है।

इन दो सस्करणोंके अतिरिक्त अन्य भी संस्करण प्रकाशित हुए हैं या नहीं, यह हमें ज्ञात नहीं है।

PAÑCASTŪPĀNVAYA*

The Jaina monks often associate themselves with one or the other Samgha, Gana Gaccha, Anvaya, Sambhoga, Śākhā, Valaya etc What these terms exactly meant, how these groups were mutually related, why particular names were given to them, etc , are matters which still await critical investigation [1] There is no doubt that these divisions primarily refer to the ascetic community, and only by implication, the lay followers came to be associated with them The great teacher Vīrasena, who finished his *Dhavalā* commentary in Śaka 738, i e , 816 A D , assigns himself to the Pañcastūpānvaya [2] An attempt is made in this paper to put together all that we know about this *anvaya* and see what historical light can be shed on this monastic branch of Jaina saints

The Paharpur (Rajshahi Dist , Bengal) Copper-plate Inscription[3] of the Gupta Year 159 (=479 A D) mentions Pañcastūpa-nikāya twice in the following passage [4]

युष्माकमिहाधिष्ठानाधिकरणे द्वि-दीनारिक्य-कुल्य-वापेन शश्वत्कालोपभोग्या-क्षयनीवी-समुदयबाह्या-प्रतिकर-खिलक्षेत्रवास्तु-विक्क्रयो (ऽ*)नुवृत्तस्तदर्हथानेनैव क्क्रमेणावयोस्सकाशाद्दीनारत्रयमुपसंगृह्यावयो(*) स्वपुण्याप्यायनाय वटगोहाल्यामवास्याङ्काशिक-पञ्चस्तूप-निकायिक-निर्ग्रन्थ-श्रमणाचार्य-गुहनन्दि शिष्य-प्रशिष्याधिष्ठित-विहारे भगवतामर्हतां गन्ध-धूप-सुमनो-दीपाद्यर्थन्तलवाटकनिमित्तञ्च अ(त *) एव वटगो-हालीतो वास्तु-द्रोणवापमध्यर्द्धञ्जम्बु-देवप्रावेश्यपृष्ठिमपोत्तके क्षेत्रं द्रोणवाप-चतुष्टयं गोषाटपुञ्जाद्द्रोण-वापचतुष्टयम् मूलनागिरट्टप्रावेश्य-नित्वगोहालीत अर्द्धत्रिकद्रोणवाप नित्येवमध्यर्द्ध क्षेत्र-कुल्यवापमक्षय-नीव्या दातुमि [ति] [*] यत प्रथमपुस्तपाल दिवाकरनन्दि-पुस्तपालधृतिविष्णु-विरोचन-रामदास-हरिदास-शशिनन्दि[सु]प्रभ-मनुद[त्ताना]मवधारण यावधृतम् अस्त्यस्मदधिष्ठानाधिकरणे द्वि दीनारिक्कय-कुल्यवापेन शाश्वत्कालोपभोग्या क्षयनीवी-समुदय-बाह्याप्रतिकर-[खिल*] क्षेत्रवास्तुविक्कयो (ऽ*) नुवृत्तस्तद्यद्युष्मा न्ब्राह्मण-नाथशर्म्मा एतद्भार्या रामी च पलाशाट्ट-पार्श्विक-वटगोहाली-स्था [यि] [काशि*] क-पञ्चस्तूप-कुल-निकायिक-आचार्य-निर्ग्रंथ-गुहनन्दि-शिष्यप्रशिष्याधिष्ठित-सद्विहारे अरहतां गंन्ध [धूपा] द्युपयोगाय [तलवा] टक-निमित्तञ्च तत्रैव वटगोहाल्या वास्तु-द्रोणवापमध्यर्द्धं क्षेत्रञ्जम्बुदेव-प्रावेश्य-पृष्ठिमपोत्तके द्रोणवाप-चतुष्टयं गोषाटपुञ्जा-द्रोणवाप-चतुष्टयं मूलनागिरट्ट-प्रावेश्य-नित्यगोहालीतो द्रोणवाप-द्वयमाढव-[प-द्व] याधिकामेन्येवमध्यर्द्धं क्षेत्रकुल्यवापम्प्रार्थयते (ऽ*) त्र न कश्चिद्विरोध गुणस्तु यत्परम-भट्टारक पादानमर्थोपचयो धर्म्म-षड्भागाप्यायनञ्च भवति [।*]

* This is published in the Karnataka Historical Review, VII, 1-2, Dharwar 1949

[1] Ample material for such a study is available from epigraphic and literary sources See A Guérinot *Repertoire D'epigraphie Jaina*, Paris 1908, Introduction pp 35-68, A N UPADHYE Yāpanīya Samgha *Journal of the University of Bombay*, I vi May 1933

[2] The *Saṭkhaṇḍāgama*, Vol I, Intro , pp 11, 36 etc , Amraoti 1939

[3] This is issued by the Āyuktakas of Pundravardhana, the headquarters of the province, to be identified with Mahāsthān in the Bogra Dist , Bengal

[4] K N DIKSHIT *Epigraphia Indica*, XX, pp ff The text (lines 4-17) is faithfully copied here from *Select Inscriptions*, Vol I, pp 346-49

Here we have a reference to a *vihāra* (at Vatagohālī) presided over by pupils and grand-pupils of Guhanandi, styled as Nigrantha-śramanâcārya or ācārya, of the Pañcastūpa (kula) nikāya, perhaps belonging to Kāśī or Banaras Pañcastūpa, it is suggested, is the name of a locality, mod Pañchtūpī The reading *Kāśika* is uncertain, and consequently the association of P -nikāya with Banaras is just a matter of conjecture

Then at Śravana Belgol,[1] there is a mutilated inscription which is assigned to *C* Śaka 572 (+78=650 A D) It runs thus

> ममास्तूपान्व सकले गदुगुरु ।
> ख्यातो वृषभनन्दीति तपोज्ञानाब्धिपारग ॥
>
> अन्तेवासी च तस्यासीदुपवासपरो गुरु ।
> विद्या-सलिल-निर्द्धूत शेमुषी को जितेन्द्रियः ॥
>
> स ततपो तपसैर्य्योग-प्रभावोऽस्य तु ।
> वन्द्योऽनाहित-कामनो निरुपम ख्यात्या स ना ॥
>
> द्रष्ट्वा ज्ञानविलोचनेन महता स्वायुष्यमेवं पुन ।
> पू गृहं गुरुरसौ यो स्थित वश ॥
>
> कटवप्र-शैल-शिखरे सन्यस्य शास्त्रक्रमात् ।
> ध्यान दा मणिमुखे प्रक्षिप्य कर्म्मेन्धनं ॥
>
> दिव्य-सुखं प्रशस्तक-धिया सम्प्राप्य सर्व्वेश्वर- ।
> ज्ञानं न्तमिदं किमत्र तपसा सर्व सुखं प्राप्यत ॥

There is no doubt that *mamāstūpānva* is a mistaken reading of Pañcastūpānvaya due to partly mutilated letters

Later in his *Dhavala*,[2] composed in 816 A D , Vīrasena refers to the Pañcastūpānvaya in this manner

> अज्जज्जणदिसिस्सेणुज्जुव-कम्मस्स चदसेणस्स ।
> तह णत्तवेण पंचत्थूहण्णय-भाणुणा मुणिणा ॥
>
> सिद्धंतछंदजोइसवायरणपमाणसत्थणिवुणेण ।
> भट्टारएण टीका लिहिएसा वीरसेणेण ॥

Then Jinasena, the pupil of Vīrasena, refers to the Pañcastūpānvaya of his *guru* in the praśasti of *Jayadhavalā*,[3] finished in Śaka 759 (+78=837 A D)

> यस्तपोदीप्तकिरणैर्भव्याम्भोजानि बोधयन् ॥
> व्यद्योतिष्ट मुनीनेन पञ्चस्तूपान्वयाम्बरे ॥ २५ ॥

[1] *Epigraphia Carnatica* II No 75, pp 38 (Text), 40-41 (Translation) etc *Upavāsapara* is an adjective and not a proper name

[2] The *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, Amraoti 1939, Intro pp 35-36 PREMI *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, pp 497 etc

[3] Ibidem, p 37 *Kasāyapāhuḍa*, Vol I, Intro pp 69-70

प्रशिष्यश्चन्द्रसेनस्य च शिष्योऽप्यार्यनन्दिनाम् ।
कुलं गणं च संतानं स्वगुणैरुदजिज्वलत् ॥ २६ ॥

तस्य शिष्योऽभवच्छ्रीमान् जिनसेन समिद्धधी. ।
अविद्धावपि यत्कर्णौ विद्धौ ज्ञानशलाकया ॥ २७ ॥

In this connection it is necessary to note that Gunabhadra who finished the *Mahāpurāna*[1] (some time before Śaka 820, i e., 898 A D , in which year it was glorified by Lokasena), left incomplete by his teacher Jinasena, makes no reference to Pañcastūpānvaya, but specifically puts both Vīrasena and Jinasena under Senānvaya of the Mūlasamgha

मूलसंघवाराशौ मणीनामिव सर्चिषाम् ।
महापुरुषरत्नानां स्थानं सेनान्वयोऽजनि ॥ २ ।

तत्र वित्रासिताशेषप्रवादिमदवारण ।
वीरसेनाग्रणीर्वीरसेनभट्टारको बभौ ॥ ३ ॥

अभवदिव हिमाद्रेर्देवसिन्धुप्रवाहो
ध्वनिरिव सकलज्ञात्सर्वशास्त्रैकमूर्तिः
उदयगिरितटाद्वा भास्करो भासमानो
मुनिरनु जिनसेनो वीरसेनादमुष्मात् ॥ ८ ॥

Indranandi in his *Śrutāvatāra*,[2] which contains some bits of information about the ascetic organisation, throws some interesting light on the Pañcastūpānvaya

(*a*) Arhadbali of Pundravardhana[3] called some monks coming from Pañcastūpyanivāsa by names ending in -sena and others in -bhadra

पञ्चस्तूप्यनिवासादुपगता येऽनगारिणस्तेषु ।
काश्चित्सेनाभिख्यान् काँश्चिद् भद्राभिधानकरोत् ॥

(*b*) Indranandi quotes the following verse as *uktam ca*, perhaps it is a traditionally memorised verse on which his view is based

आयातौ नन्दिवीरौ प्रकटगिरिगुहावासतोऽशोकवाटाद्
देवाश्चान्योऽपरादिर्जित इति यतिपौ सेनभद्राह्वयौ च ॥

पञ्चस्तूप्यात् सगुप्तो गणधरवृषभ शाल्मलीवृक्षमूलात्
निर्यातौ सिंहचन्द्रौ प्रथितगुणगणौ केसरात्खण्डपूर्वात् ॥ ९६ ॥

[1] *Uttarapurna*, pp 754-55, Calcutta Samvat 1975

[2] See *Tattvānuśāsanādisamgrahah* in the Mānikachand Digambara Jaina Granthamālā No 13, pp 74-89, Bombay Samvat 1975

[3] It is interesting to note that the earliest reference to Pañcastūpa line of teachers belongs to the same eastern part of India to which Arhadbali belonged Arhadbali was born in Puṇḍravardhana, the same headquarters from which the Paharpur record was issued

(*c*) Indranandi also notes another tradition (I think, the older) on the same topic

अन्ये जगुर्गुहाया विनिर्गता नन्दिनो महात्मानः ।
देवाश्चाशोकवनात् पञ्चस्तूप्यास्ततः सेन ॥ ९७ ॥

(*d*) Lastly, there is a slightly cryptic verse which mentions Pañcastūpya

पञ्चस्तूप्यास्तु सेनाना वीराणां शाल्मलीद्रुम ।
खण्डकेसरनामा च भद्र सिंहोऽस्य समतः ॥ १०० ॥

Indranandi is tentatively assigned to Samvat 11th century, the date is not final, but I have no doubt that he is later than Jinasena and perhaps also Gunabhadra From his verses one point is clear, namely, the tradition is struggling to connect monks with name-endings Sena and Bhadra with the Pañcastūpa

Thus, as far as we know, the Paharpur record contains the earliest and the *Śrutâvatāra* the latest reference to the Pañcastūpa line of monks This *anvaya* perhaps hailed from the North where it was well known by 478 A D and of which the earliest known monk is Guhanandi Then by about the middle of the 7th century A D, the monks of this *anvaya* were found in the South, and a pupil of Vrsabhanandi of this line died at Śravana Belgol by observing Sallekhanā Then in 816 A D, Vīrasena describes himself as the sun of Pañcastūpānvaya, his teacher was Āryanandi and his grand teacher was Candrasena The available references show that after Vīrasena the title of this *anvaya*, i e, Pañcastūpānvaya, was superseded by Senānvaya, and we see how Gunabhadra includes not only Jinasena but also Vīrasena under Senānvaya It is not surprising, therefore, that after Gunabhadra, Indranandi gives not only Sena but also Bhadra as name-ending of the monks of the Pañcastūpānvaya It may be noted, however, that the earlier records show that the names of teachers of the Pañcastūpānvaya ended in -nandi (Guhanandi etc)

The *Dhavalā* commentary clearly shows that Vīrasena was highly gifted with the knowledge of Siddhānta, and he was a pupil of Āryanandi We know how the Siddhānta knowledge was imparted to two pupils from the South by Dharasena who was staying at Girnar His name ends in *sena*, but we do not get a specific mention of his *anvaya* In inheriting and propounding the Siddhānta knowledge the monks of the Pañcastūpānvaya appear to have played an important role

The earliest known epigraphic reference to the Senagana is found in the Mulgund Inscription of 903 A D,[1] so we may not be quite wrong in supporing that with Jinasena the name of Senānvaya or Senagana (instead of Pañcastūpānvaya) became more prominent After Indranandi, no one appears to have taken any cognizance of Pañcastūpānvaya

It is difficult to offer any exact interpretation of Pañcastūpânvaya It is quite likely that it is derived from a locality possessing five Stūpas but that is only a conjecture[2] A village Pāñchthūpī is already referred to above If that is accepted, we will have to

[1] *Repertoire d'epigraphie Jaina*, No 127, pp 106-107

[2] See my earlier Remarks on this topic in the *Brhat-kathakosa* Intro p 90, Notes pp 378-79 cf page 78 of this compendium

admit that this *anvaya* originated in Bengal, and the monks[1] of this line travelled as far as Śravana Beḷgola carrying the torch of Siddhānta knowledge and proving the severity of their penances[2]

[1] The names of the monks of the Pañcastūpānvaya, known to us, are as below chronologically Guhanandi, Vṛṣabhanandi, Candrasena, Āryanandi and Vīrasena Jinasena, the pupil of Vīrasena, does not specifically mention his *anvaya* while Gunabhadra, the pupil of Jinasena assigns his teacher and grand teacher to Senānvaya So in our enumeration we have to stop with Vīrasena

[2] Major portion of this paper was submitted to the Prākrit and Jainism Section of the All India Oriental Conference, Darbhanga A Hindi draft of it I contributed to the Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara XVI, 1, pp 1-6, Arrah 1949

ASAGA AND HIS WORKS*

The 2500th Anniversary of the Nirvāna of Bhagavān Mahāvīra is being celebrated soon, all over the world, as a mark of respect to that great personality whose doctrines of Ahimsā, Anekānta and Aparigraha are a panacea for the baser tendencies of Violence, Intolerance and excessive Greed at the levels of the individual, society or nation The Jaina Samskṛti Samrakshaka Sangha, Sholapur, founded by the late Br Jīvarāj Gautamchandaji has rendered, during the last twenty-five years, significant service to the cause of Jaina literature, embodying the teachings of Mahāvīra and his great disciples of yore, through numerous publications in Sanskrit, Prākrit, Apabhramśa, Hindī, Marāthī, Kannada and English It is but natural that the authorities of this Granthamālā planned to publish, on the occasion of this celebration, the biography of Mahāvīra, namely, the Vardhamāna-carita of Asaga along with Hindī translation That is how this edition of the Vardhamāna-carita of Asaga is being placed in the hands of readers

The Mss of the Mahāvīra-caritra (*MC*), or Vardhamāna-caritra (*VC*) or- purāna (*VP*) or Sanmati-caritra (*SC*) of Asaga are reported to exist in Arrah, Karanja, Vaianga, Humch, Idar, Bombay, Mysore, Poona, Svadi, Moodbidri, Madras, Adyar and other places Those of his Śāntināthapurāna (*ŚP*) are reported to exist in Poona, Limbdi, Ajmer, Bombay and Bodlean Library in U K It is reported that the Bodlean Library has also an abridgement of it in twelve chapters, the original work having sixteen cantos [1] The distribution of the Mss of these works of Asaga shows their wide circulation There might be some Mss, here and there, in private collections as well

So far no Sanskrit commentary on Asaga's poems has come to light Shri V B Lokapur[2] has come across a palm-leaf Ms containing a Kannada Vyākhyāna on the Vardhamānapurāna It gives the Anvaya and meaning in Kannada all this would enable one to understand the text The concluding passage gives some information about the commentator His name is Vije (=Vijaya) rāja, he belonged to the Vasistha-gotra, he was a resident of Belagula (the same as Śravana-B), and he completed it in Śaka 1402, i e, A D 1480 Shri Lokapur has not noted where the Ms exists It is better that we know more about it I have been informed that there is a Ms of the Vardhamāna-purāna with a Kannada commentary in the Upādhyāya family of Halagi (Dt Belgaum) My inquiry has not been so far fruitful

A Hindī translation of *VP* was prepared by Pt Khubchand Shastri and also published some years back (Surat, 1917) Both *VP* and *ŚP* were edited and translated into Marāthī by Pt J P Phadakule and published by the late Raoji Sakhārām Doshi from Sholapur in 1931 and 1935 respectively The former was in book size, but the latter, in Pothi size with loose sheets

* This essay was contributed as a 'General Editorial' to the Edition of the Vardhamāna-carita ed by Pandit Pannalal-Sāhityācārya and Published in the Jivarāj Jaina Granthamālā, Sholapur 1973

[1] H D Velankar Jinaratna-kosa, Poona, 1940, pp 336, 342, 381

[2] Jayanti, July, 1955, page 48

Asaga gives some information about himself in both these works at their end It is better that the verses are reproduced here, mainly based on the printed editions for ready reference, because the translators have not taken them identically (M P XVIII 102-5)

कृतं महावीरचरित्रमेत । न्मया परस्वप्रतिबोधनार्थम् ।
सप्ताधिकत्रिंशभवप्रबन्धं । पुरूरवाद्यन्तिम वीरनाथम् ॥ १०२ ॥

वर्धमानचरित्रं य प्रत्याख्याति शृणोति च ।
तस्येहपरलोकस्य सौख्यं सञ्जायतेतराम् ॥ १०३ ॥[1]

संवत्सरे दशनवोत्तरवर्षयुक्ते
भावादिकीर्तिमुनिनायकपादमूले ।
मौद्गल्यपर्वतनिवासवनस्थसंपत्-[2]
सच्छ्राविकाप्रजनिते सति वा ममत्वे ॥ १०४ ॥

विद्या मया प्रपठितेत्यसगाह्वयेन
श्रीनाथराज्यमखिलं जनतोपकारि ।
प्राप्यैव चोडविषये विरलानगर्यां
ग्रन्थाष्टकं च समकारि जिनोपदिष्टम् ॥ १०५ ॥

Pts Jinadasa and Pannalal differ in grouping these verses and also in translating them In my opinion the verse No 103 is either misplaced, or a later addition So I leave that verse altogether it just mentions the fruit of propounding and hearing this *MC*, in this and in the next world I would group together verses Nos 102 and 104, and take 105 independently To render them freely With a view to enlightening myself and others, this Mahāvīra-carita, in which are described thirty-seven Bhavas beginning with that of Purūrava and ending with that of Vīranātha, was composed by me (in Samvatsara 910 at the feet of the great monk Bhāvakīrti, liking for or interest (*mamatva*) in its being evinced by a pious Śrāvikā, Sampat by name, who dwelt on the mount Maudgalya in a park (or who dwelt in a settlement Vana by name on the mount Maudgalya) Various branches of learning were studied by me, Asaga by name And having reached (*prāpya*) the kingdom of Śrīnātha, which was beneficial to all the people, eight works dealing with Jainism or incorporating the instructions of Jina, were composed by me in the town of Viralā (also read a Varalā or Dharalā) in the Coda territory

In this context it is interesting to note that the concluding verses are not identical in all the Mss of the *VC* Peterson, in his Report for 1886-92, gives the concluding portion of the *VC* from a Ms dated Samvat 1679 After the colophon *ity Asaga-kṛte* etc , of the 18th Sarga, there are the following verses [3]

[1] In the printed text is a misprint that the word *anuṣṭup* which should have been the title for the stanza has got mixed up in the verse

[2] A reading *vratastha* for *vanstha* would upset the metre A reading like this is also available

[3] They are quoted in full below, 1-4 These common verses in the Praśastis indicate that one and the same Asaga is the author of *VC* and *ŚP*

मुनिचरणरजोभि etc as in *ŚP*
तनुमपि तनुतां etc as in *ŚP*
भक्तिं परां etc as in *ŚP*
पुत्रस्तयोरसग etc as in *ŚP*

सद्वृत्तं दधता स्वभावमृदुना निःश्रेयसप्रार्थिना
साधूना हृदयोपमेन शुचिना संप्रेरित. प्रेयसा ।
एतत्सादरमार्यनन्दिगुरुणा सिद्धये व्यधात्सासग
कीर्त्युत्कीर्तनमात्रचारुचरितं श्रीसन्मते सन्मते ॥
इति वर्धमानचरितं समाप्तम् ।

The first four verses give the biographical details about Asaga, and they are noted below from the *ŚP* The fifth verse gives some additional information that Asaga completed the *MC* or Sanmati-carita (as titled here) being encouraged by Āryanandi-guru whose great virtues are mentioned by him in details

In the *Śāntipurāna* more biographical details are available The relevant verses may be quoted here

मुनिचरणरजोभि सर्वदाभूत [पूत] धात्र्यां प्रणतिसमयलग्नै पावनीभूतमूर्धा ।
उपशम इव मूर्त शुद्धसम्यक्त्वयुक्त पटुमतिरिति नाम्ना विश्रुत श्रावकोऽभूत ॥ १ ॥

तनुमपि तनुतां य सर्वपर्वोपवासैस्तनुमनुपमधी स्म प्रापयन् सचिनोति ।
सततमपि विभूतिं भूयसीमन्नदान प्रभृतिभिरुरुपुण्य कुन्दशुभ्रं यशश्च ॥ २ ॥

भक्तिं परामविरतं समपक्षपाता । दातन्वती मुनिनिकायचतुष्टये ऽपि ।
वैरेतिरित्यनुपमा[1] भुवि तस्य भार्या । सम्यक्त्वशुद्धिरिव [मूर्तिमती] पराभूत् ॥ ३ ॥

पुत्रस्तयोरसग इत्यवदातकीर्त्योरासीन्मनीषिनिवहप्रमुखस्य शिष्य ।
चन्द्रांशुशुभ्रयशसो भुवि नागनन्द्याचार्यस्य शब्दसमयार्णवपारगस्य ॥ ४ ॥

तस्याभवद् भव्यजनस्य सेव्य सखा जिनापो[2] जिनधर्मसक्त ।
ख्यातोऽपि शौर्यात् परलोकभीरुर्द्विजादिनाथोऽपि विपक्षपात ॥ ५ ॥

व्याख्यानशीलत्वमवेक्ष्य तस्य श्रद्धां पुराणेषु च पुण्यबुद्धे. ।
कवित्वहीनोऽपि गुरौ निबन्धे[3] त.स्समधासीदसग. प्रबन्धम् ॥ ६ ॥

चरितं विरचय्य सन्मतीयं सदलंकारविचित्रवृत्तबन्धम् ।
स पुराणमिदं व्यधत्त शान्तेरसग साधुजनप्रमोहशान्त्यै[4] ॥ ७ ॥

[1] Also Veritti

[2] Jinnappa is quite a common name among the Jainas even today in some parts of Karnataka

[3] Also we have to read *guror nibandhe*

[4] Years back there appeared a note on these Praśastis, possibly written by the late Pt Jugal Kishorji, Jaina Hitaishi, XV, pp 336 f It is necessary that some more Mss will have to be consulted to understand the presence of these Praśastis

There was a famous Śrāvaka Patumati by name He always paid respects to monks by touching his head to the ground which was rendered pure by the dust from the feet of the monks He was an embodiment of mild passions He was endowed with pure Right Faith He was a man of intelligence His body was lean, and he rendered it all the more lean by observing fasts on *Parva* days He earned great dignity thereby And by his gift of food, etc , he acquired great merit and all-bright (lit , white like *kunda* flower) fame His wife was Vairetti, for whom there could be no parallel in the society With the same respect she always showed great devotion to the four fold congregation of monks She was religious purity incarnate (*samyaktva*=right faith) Both of them were so well-known and Asaga was their son He was a pupil of Ācārya Nāganandi who was prominent among the wise or learned, whose spotless fame was spreading everywhere and who was well versed in *śabda* (grammar) and *samaya* (scripture) Asaga had a friend Jināpa (by name) who was devoted to Jina-dharma and liked by the pious Jināpa, though known for his bravery, was afraid of the next world, and though he was high-born, he was free from prejudice or partiality (there is *śleṣa* here) Seeing that Jināpa (or meritorious intention) had faith in and liking for the exposition of Purāna and out of great attachment for him (some have read *guror nibandhe*), Asaga composed this poem, though quite aware of the limitations of his poetic abilities After having composed the Sanmati-carita which is rich in poetic embellishments and variety of metrical patterns, Asaga composed this Śāntipurāna for diluting the worldly attachment of pious people

Asaga's relation with the three Ācāryas can be clearly indicated (*i*) Asaga was a sisya of Nāganandi, who is *śabdasamayārnava-pāraga* Possibly he had studied under him and owed pious allegiance to him (*ii*) Āryanandi-guru encouraged Asaga to compose the *VC* or Sanmati-carita (*iii*) Asaga completed his *VP* at the feet of, or while staying with, or even under the guidance of Bhāvakīrti His reference to all the three can be easily understood and accounted for

This is all that Asaga has said about himself and his works It is necessary to see what other poets have said about him, before some of his details are critically scrutinised

Dhavala, the author of the Harivamśapurāna in Apabhramśa refers to Asaga and his Vīrajinendra-carita in this way[1]

असगु महाकव जे सुमणोहरु
वीरजिणेंदचरित किअ सुदरु ।
केत्तिय कहमि सुकइगुण आयर
गेय कव्व जहिं विरइय सुदर ॥

To render it freely, Asaga is a great poet who has composed his beautiful and attractive Vīrajinendra-carita in which beautiful verses have been woven, the merits of which are beyond expression These compliments are on par with what Asaga himself has said about his *VC* Dhavala has not given his date, but he is tentatively assigned to the tenth or eleventh century A D

[1] Allahabad University Journal, Vol I, p 167

Pŏnna,[1] one of the three great poets of Kannada refers to Asaga, and claims his superiority (perhaps a bit exaggerated)[2] both over Asaga in Kannada (by hundred times) and over Kālidāsa in Sanskrit (by four times), in his Śāntipurāna (I 11)[3]

कन्नड कवितेयोळसं-
गं नूर्मडिरेखेगग्गळं सक्कद्दॊळ ।
मुन्तुळ्ळ काळिदासं-
गं नाल्वडि रचनेयोळ्ॆ कुरुळ्गाळ सवर्ण ॥

Pŏnna's specification indicates that he knew Asaga as a Kannada poet just in the manner that he speaks of Kālidāsa as a Sanskrit poet of the past Pŏnna is very much indebted to Kālidāsa that is a good evidence for his proficiency in earlier Sanskrit literature He refers to Asaga, as noted above,[4] in his Śāntipurāna and we have today before us the Śāntipurāna of Asaga in Sanskrit He is naturally indebted to Asaga's work The late A P. Chaugule has shown how Pŏnna is indebted in descriptions, ideas and expressions to Asaga's work[5] It is not unlikely that some of the ideas are a common inheritance from earlier Sanskrit works There is some controversy about Pŏnna's date, because he has not mentioned any himself Different dates assigned to the Śāntipurāna by scholars namely from *c* 933, *c* 950 or *c* 973 This reference to Asaga by Pŏnna establishes two facts that Asaga wrote in Kannada too and that he was earlier than Pŏnna, the latest date for whom is *c* 973 A D

Durgasimha, whose date is now ascertained to be 1031 A D, mentions Asaga, in his Kannada Pamcatantra,[6] along with other poets Manasija and Candrabhatta

पोसतेनिसि देसियिं नव-
रसमेसेयल्कोळ्पुवेत्त मार्गदिनिळेगे
नेसेदुवो सुकविगळेने नेग-
ळ्दसगन मनसिजन चंद्रभट्टन कृतिगळ् ॥

Here Asaga is credited with the cultivation of Deśī style endowed with nine Rasas or poetic flavours

Lately, one Ms of the Vardhamānapurāna of Nāgavarma II, A D 1042, has come to light, and it is to be soon published by the Institute of Kannada Studies, University of

[1] Pampa has not mentioned Asaga, as noted by the Editor

[2] D L NARASIMHACHAR Pīṭhikegaḷu Lekhanagalu, Mysore, 1971, pp 295 ff

[3] VENKATA RAU AND H SESHA AYYANGAR, with an Intro in English by R Tata, Madras, 1929

[4] There is another context where Ponna refers to Asaga by *Śleṣa* (XII 23) and possibly to some five works of the latter

[5] A P CHAUGULE Ponnana mele Asagana Prabhāva, Jinavijaya in Kannada, XII 1, Belgaum, January, 1952, pp 4 ff

[6] Ed S G NARASIMHACHAR AND M A RAMANUJAYYANGAR, Mysore, 1898 See Kavicarite, Vol I[2] Bangalore, 1961, p 35, App 2

Mysore, Mysore. He refers to Asaga in his work Vardhamānapurāṇa (I 27) in this manner [1]

कन्नडदोळ् नेग[ळ्ते]यसगं गजगं गुणनंदि पोन्नने
बन्नने संस्कृतोक्तिगे मयूरन बाणन काळिदासनो- ।
रन्नने बेरे मत्तिनव्विविगरोळिगरोळ्पोणर्चिपे-
ळ्दन्नने बल्मेवेत्त कविताहृदयदोळ् कवितागुणोदयं ॥

Nayasena, in his Dharmāmrta (A D 1112)[2] speaks of a number of great qualities of different poets and yearns that his work be endowed with them (I 39)

असगन देसि पोन्नन महोन्नतिवेत्त बेडंगु पंपनों
दसदृशमप्पपूर्वरसभाव गजांकुशनोळ्पुवेत्तु रं-
जिसुव सदर्थदृष्टि गुणवर्मन जाण् कविरन्ननोजे शो-
भिसे नेदसिर्के धारिणिमनंगोळे मत्कृतियोळ् निरंतरं ॥

He refers to the Desī style of Asaga This shows that Asaga composed some Kannada works in the Desī or indigenous style, as against Mārga or classical Sanskrit style

Brahmaśiva, (*c* 1100-30) in his Samayaparīkse[3], refers to Asaga by the synonym of the word, Rajaka, thus (I 35)

पोन्नने पंपने रचकने
रन्नने कवितागुणोदयने दर्शनसं-
पन्नतेयोळ् कवितेयोळव-
रन्नने विदितात्मभावनगाळदेव ॥

The word *asaga* is an older form of *agasa*, a washerman It is this that possibly led Pōnna to have that *ślesa* like this, in his Śāntipurāna (XII 73) ·

अरदु कषायोदकदोळ्
तोय्दसगंबोल् नृपेंद्रसभेयेव कॉळ्-
कुय्द् [ळसदलेदु सिलेयोळ्]
पोय्दं कविचक्रवर्ति कविचीवरमं ॥

But there is no evidence to say that Asaga was a washerman by profession. On the other hand, it is clear from his biographical details noted above that he was a pious Śrāvaka

[1] I am thankful to Shri B S Sanniah for kindly giving this extract

[2] Ed R SHAMA SHASTRY Vols. I and II, Mysore, 1924-26

[3] Ed B S KULKARNI, Dharwar, 1958

As I understand the term, his name really stands for Asamga, colloquially popularised as Asaga

Ācanna (c 1190-1220) remembers Asaga in his Vardhamānapurāṇa[1] in this way (I 18):

> श्रीविजयं गजांकुशनुदात्तयशं गुणवर्मना जग-
> त्पावन नागवर्मनसगं रसिकामणिहंपदेवना ।
> भावकचक्रि होन्निगनिळ्ळनुत रन्निगनग्गळं-
> श्रीविभुवोप्पनेंब कविकंदर्पेरिदेसेवत्तु भूतळं ॥

He mentions Nāgavarma also whose Vardhamāna-carita has lately come to light as noted above Shri B S Sannaiah who is editing it tells me that Ācanna is indebted to Nāgavarma and close similarities are found in both the works It is a matter of further investigation whether Ācanna is directly indebted to Asaga or through Nāgavarma

Keśirāja (c 1260 A D), in his Śabdamaṇidarpana[2] refers to Asaga from whose works he appears to have collected his illustrations (5)

> गजगन गुणनंदिय मन-
> सिजनसगन चंद्रभट्ट गुणवर्मश्री-
> विजयर पोन्नन पंपन
> सुजनोत्तंसन सुमार्गमिदरोळे लक्ष्यं ॥

Namjumḍakavi (A D 1525) also refers to Asaga in his Kumārarāmakathe[3]

> गजगन गुणवर्मन नागचंद्रन
> सुजनोत्तंसन असगन ।
> सुजन रन्नन शांतिवर्मन पद्मर-
> सिजगळिगोल्डिदेरगुवेनु ॥

All these references show that Asaga was well known to a number of Kannada authors It is difficult to say that every one of them was directly in touch with Asaga's works either in Kannaḍa or Sanskrit Ponna had used Asaga's Śāntipurāna, and it is quite likely that Nāgavarma and even Ācanna had used the *VP* of Asaga

It is necessary to scrutinise critically some of the items of information supplied by Asaga himself

Asaga tells us that he composed eight works embodying the introductions of Jina For the present, we have only two of his works in Sanskrit, Vardhamāna-and Śāntipurāna, and so far none of his work, in Kannaḍa, has come to light.

[1] Ed MARIYAPPA BHATTA AND M GOVIND RAO, Madras, 1953

[2] Ed D L NARASIMHACHAR, Mysore, 1959

[3] Ed H DEVEERAPPA, Mysore.

Jayakīrtı (*c* 1000 A D , any way earlier than the middle of the 12th century A.D) ın hıs Chandonuśāsana[1] VII 7, ıllustrates some metrıcal patterns ın Kannaḍa. He has the followıng verse to ıllustrate *samānākṣara*

> रतिपतिगणयुग्माद्रतित स्मरयुग्मं रतिःपि (च पुनः)
> प्रतिपादं वर्तते यस्मिंस्तत्समानाक्षरं नाम ।
> अतिकान्तमक्षरदक्षैराहतमसगाख्यकविना
> प्रतिपादितं ननु कर्णाटकुमारसंभवकाव्ये ॥ ७ ॥

Further ıt ıs added thus by Jayakīrtı (VII 16)

> कन्दर्पगणतो रतिगणचतुष्कं चेत्
> छन्दसि जयकीर्तेराद्विराह्वाख्या ।
> छन्दोऽवतंसनामेति चतुष्पदिका
> संदृष्टासौ कुमारसंभवादौ ॥ १६ ॥

Here ıs a clear statement of Jayakīrtı that Asaga wrote the Karnata Kumārasambhava-kāvya It ıs not dıscovered so far, and naturally a good deal of speculatıon permeates ıt

In the colophon of the Sarga V of the Vardhamāna-purāna, the author's name appears as Asagabhūpa It creates a doubt whether Asaga was a ruler, but there ıs no such ındıcatıon ın hıs bıographıcal detaıls One chıef Asagamarasa ıs known ın the famıly of Śamkaragamda, a feudatory of Rāstrakūta Krıshna III (A D 939-67), and another called Asaga (*c* 950 A D) of the Kalachūrı famıly of Kalyāna ıs mentıoned[2] But these are all later than Asaga, The term *bhūpa* occurs only ın one colophon, and the author hımself has not saıd anythıng ın thıs regard Pt Pannalal, ın hıs translatıon presented ın this edıtıon, takes *prāpya* 'havıng acquıred' but, ıt ıs not justıfied In hıs ıntroductıon, however, he takes 'havıng reached'

It has not been possıble so far to ıdentıfy kıng Śrīnātha, the mount Maudgalya and the town Vıralā They have to be searched for ın the Coda-vısaya or the Telugu are adjacent to Karnataka

The date of the composıtıon of the Vardhamāna-purāna ıs stated as

> संवत्सरे दशनवोत्तरवर्षयुक्ते ;

but ıt ıs far from a clear statement Most of the scholars have ınterpreted ıt as 910[3] Some have taken ıt as Śaka era, because ıt was mostly current ın the South, and equated ıt wıth A D 988[4] Years back, I suggested that ıt should be taken as Samvat,[5] and later,

[1] H D VELANKAR Jayadāman, Bombay, 1949, pp 37, 67 and 68

[2] P B DESAI Jaınısm ın South Indıa, Sholapur, 1959, p 368 A Hıstory of Karnataka, Dharwar 1970, p 216

[3] 914 ıs a mısprınt ın the Hındı translatıon ın thıs Edıtıon

[4] H L JAIN Catalogue of Sanskrıt and Prakrıt Mss ın C P and Berar (Nagpur, 1926), see, also hıs Bhāratīya Samskrıtıme Jaına Dharmakā Yogadāna, Bhopal, 1962, p 170 Pt J. P Phadakule ın hıs ıntroductıons

[5] ASAGA hıs works and date The Karnataka Hıstorıcal Quarterly, II, ı, pp 42 ff , Dharwar, 1932 K. M Sharma Date of Asaga's Vardhamānacharıta, New Indıan Antıquary, Vol IV, Bombay, 1941-42

the late R Narasimhachar has arrived at same conclusion [1] The Śaka 910 or A D 988 goes against the known fact that Pōnna has used the Śāntipurāna which was written after the Vardhamāna-purāna as noted by the author himself, and the latest date assigned to Pōnna is 973 A D Asaga has to be sufficiently earlier than Pōnna, and this is possible only if the date 910 is taken as the Vikarama Samvat, i e , equal to A D 853 Thus Asaga flourished in the middle of the 9th century, and wrote his *VP* in A D. 853 [2]

Asaga mentions three Jaina Teachers (*i*) Bhāvakīrti, in whose presence (*pādamūle*) he completed the *VP* for the benefit of the pious Śrāvikā, Sampat (*ii*) Āryanandi who encouraged him to complete the *VP* and (*iii*) Nāganandi whose *śiṣya* he calls himself Some Ācāryas of these names are known from inscriptions, etc , but one cannot propose identity simply from the similarity of names, because there have been many Ācāryas of the same name It is obvious that the place of the literary activity of Asaga was the Telugu-Karnataka area, and he flourished in the middle of the 9th century A D One Āryanandi[3] was the teacher of Vīrasena who completed his Dhavalā in *c* 815 A D But this would be too early a date for the teacher of Asaga The Gokak Copper-plates of Indranandi donate a grant of 50 Nivartanas of land made to one Āryanandi who belonged to Jambu-khamdi-gana Evidently the grant is made to a guild for the purpose of worshpping the idol of Arhat, and for (the support of) preceptors and ascetics The grant was made with the permission of the Rāṣṭrakūta king Gojja, i e , Govinda IV (928-33 A D) in the year Śaka 845 or 923 A D [4] Then in an inscription (date not specified) at Vallimalai, it is noted that one Āryanandi, disciple of Bālacandra, got engraved an image of the teacher Govar-dhana [5] In Tamil Nadu, Arcot Dt , at Kalagu-malai and Pamchapāndava-malai there is an epigraph to state that an image of Yaksinī was worshipped by the teacher Nāganandi But this is the Tamil area and the date is not given [6] It is tentatively assigned to the 8th century A D Nandipottarasa is identified with Pallava Nandivarman (A D 717-779) But there is no mention of Śrīnātha here as Cola-sāmanta, nor is the source of this information given by the editor There is an inscription in Ranibennur (Dt Dharwar), dated 860 A D and belonging to the period of Rāshtrakūta Amoghavarsa I It mentions the grant of some lands to Nāganandi Ācārya of the Simhavūra-gana The date and locality suit for identification with Naganandi mentioned by Asaga, but one cannot be definite Apara-jitasūri had studied under Nāganandi at whose instance he composed his commentary on the (Bhagavatī-) Ārādhanā [7] Nāganandi in the Sravana Belgola inscriptions is not a monk at all Another Nāganandi, who was a Bhattāraka, belongs to the 14th century A D

[1] Karnāṭaka Kavicarite, 2nd ed , 1961, also revised 2nd ed , Bangalore, 1972

[2] About Asaga, Shri V B Lokapur has contributed a number of articles in Kannaḍa He has shed a good deal of additional light on this poet Some of them are Asaga Kaviya Khyāti, Prabuddha Karnataka, for 1954-55, Mysore Asagana Vardhamānapurānada Kannaḍa Vyākhyāna, Jayanti, July, 1955 Asagana Kannaḍa Kumāra Sambhava, Kannada Nudi 52 (15 ?) See also, R S Mugli Kannaḍa Sāhitya Caritre, 1953, pp 27, 30, 47, 50

[3] N PREMI Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa, Bombay, 1956, p 128

[4] Karnatak Historical Review, Vol I, ii, pp 43 ff

[5] E HULTZSCH E I , IV No 15

[6] V VENKAYYA E I , IV, No 6 and No 14 A R A S , p 209 Also P B Desai, *ibid* , B L Rice has noted (Mysore Inscriptions Translated, Bangalore, 1879) one Nāganandi who was a Guru of the three princes of the Gaṅga Dynasty Kāḷa Vallabharāya, Govinda Rāya and Caturbhuja Kanaradeva. But this needs verification

[7] See my Introduction, p 56, to the Bṛhat-Kathākośa, Bombay, 1943 , cf page 46 of this compendium.

or a little earlier according to the Niśidhi record at Tagadur in Mysore [1] Any way, we have no clearcut evidence to identify any one of these with the teacher of Asaga

The Vardhamāna-carita or -purāna of Asaga is one of the earliest, if not the earliest poem dealing independently and solely with the biography of Mahāvīra The author qualifies his poem in the colophon by the expression Mahapurānopanisadi,[2] possibly hinting thereby that his work is based on the Mahāpurāna of Jinasena-Guṇabhadra He calls his *VC* a Prabhandha narrating thirty-seven Bhavas it is, to put it in plain terms, the biography of the soul of Mahāvīra in its thirty-seven births, Purūrava to Mahāvīra Of the eighteen Sargas, only the last two constitute the biography of Mahāvīra as such, the earlier sixteen being devoted to his previous births Mahāvīra's biography, stripped of conventional details and descriptions, can be summarised in short as below

King Siddhārtha of Jñata-vamśa and his queen Priyakāriṇī lived at Kundapura in Videha country For fifteen months god Tiryag-vijrambhaka showered wealth on that town Priyakāriṇī saw, in the latter half of the night, sixteen dreams, the fruits of which as Siddhārtha interpreted to her satisfaction, would be that she would carry a worthy and great son Heavenly nymphs started nursing her She gave birth to a son, a prince, on the 13th day of the bright half of Caitra, to the jubilation of one and all The gods celebrated the ceremonial bathing on birth, and noting the strength of the child on that occasion Indra named the child Vīra Right from the day she conceived, the prosperity of the family went on increasing, so the child was named Vardhamāna Once there arrived Cārana saints, Vijaya and Samjaya, and some doubts in their mind were just cleared on seeing Vardhamāna, so they named him Sanmati His boyhood was spent in various sports with his companions Once the god Samgama took the form of a serpent and confronted Vardhamāna Vardhamāna played with it, without any fear, putting his foot on its head, but his companions fled away in terror By this feat he became famous as Mahāvīra He abstained from the temptation of sense of pleasures, and accepted renunciation at the age of thirty in the Nāgakhandavana Once king Kula offered to him food duly to the great jubilation of all While Mahāvīra practised *Pratimā-yoga*, on the Atimuktaka cemetery ground, Rudra created terrors, but Mahāvīra remained firm in meditation, so he came to be known as Mahati Mahāvīra He practised severe penances and sustained meditations for twelve years He attained omniscience (Kevala-jñāna) under a Sāla tree, at Jrmbhaka-grāma on the bank of the river Rjukūlā, that being the 10th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha Kubera organised a rich audience Hall (Samavasarana) Gautama became his Ganadhara, and the divine voice flowed out of him Gautama composed twelve-fold scripture Mahāvīra toured various places, expounding seven Tattvas, nine Padārthas, etc., in reply to Indra's questions, with a view to explaining the problems of this and the next world, for thirty years At the age of 72, he attained Nirvāna at Pāvāpura in the last quarter of the night of the 14th day of the black half of Kārtika, when the star Svāti was in conjunction with the moon

The earlier lives are narrated directly or some time through the mechanism of Pūrvabhavas put in the mouth of some saint or so These Bhavas have their interest in various ways They link Mahāvīra, the last Tīrthakara, with Vrsabha the first Tīrthakara of Jainism Secondly, the Karma doctrine, which is the backbone of Jainism, is so well

[1] A R of Mysore, 1938, p 173

[2] Compare the expression Bhagavadgītopaniṣatsu in the Bhagavadgītā

demonstrated by these births· every one is responsible for one's own Karmas (in thought, word and deed), and one cannot escape them without experiencing their fruits, good or bad. Thirdly, so many characters, both human and sub-human, are introduced, and it is a psychological study by itself And lastly, good many moral and religious lessons are conveyed through various situations, persons and sermons In fact, some of the details have a great salutary effect on the pious mind and go to stabilise a religious bent of mind

What has been a Purānic theme woven round the historical personality of Mahāvīra is set into a framework of Sanskrit Kāvya with all its characteristics by Asaga The division of Sargas, metrical pattern, the nature of characters, requisite descriptions, use of embellishments, introduction of poetic flavours and the objective of the poem all these make this Prabhandha a Kāvya Asaga is well read in earlier Sanskrit Kāvyas of eminent poets like Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Māgha and others He inherits the inspiration from Jinasena, and he is steeped in Jaina dogmatics expounded in earlier works of Kundakunda, Umāsvāti, Pūjyapāda and others He has a remarkable love for poetic descriptions and details, often at the cost of the narration of the story or of events Asaga has stated that his Sanmati-carita of his is

सदलंकारविचित्रवृत्तबन्धम् ।

and this is fully borne out by the various Alamkāras and metres used by him They are studied in details by Dr Nemichandra Shastri[1] and by Pt Pannalal-sāhityāchārya, and they need not be repeated here

In addition to what Asaga has inherited from the poets and authors noted above, Pt Jinadas,[2] Dr Nemichandra Shastri and Pt Pannalal have shown how Asaga's work is indebted to the Jīvandhara-campū, Dharmaśarmābhyudaya and Candraprabha-carita which are closely studied in the circle of Jaina Panditas The common ideas and parallel expressions are quite obvious Some of them may have been inherited from earlier sources But the question who is indebted to whom has to remain an open one for further study and investigation in view of the chronological sequence of these authors and the authenticity of the passages in a particular context Asaga can be indebted only to those authors who lived earlier than the middle of the 9th century A D

The General Editor feels grateful to our President Shriman Lalchand Hirachandaji for his enlightened guidance in all our deliberations Heavier responsibilities have devolved on the broad shoulders of Shriman Walchand Deochandaji who is helping this Granthamālā in every way for its progress It is his devotion to the teachings of Mahāvīra that enabled him to bring out this publication

Our sincere thanks are due to Dr Bahuramaji Upadhyaya Saugor University for kindly gracing this edition by his Foreword

Our thanks are due to Pt Pannalalji-sahityacharya who kindly edited this work along with Introduction in Hindi and Hindi translation Thanks are due to Shri Babulal Phagulla, Mahavira Press, Varanasi for his co-operation in publishing this work

[1] Saṃskṛta Kāvyake Vikāsame Jaina Kaviyoṃkā Yogadāna, Delhi, 1971, pp 139-167

[2] In the foot-notes to his edition noted above

GENERAL INDEX

(Following abbreviations are used

Au=author, Chal=Chalukya, g=God or goddess, Inst=Institution, Kad=Kadamba, min=minister, pl=place, prec=preceptor, Pt=pandit, Rāṣṭra=Raṣṭrakūṭa, sa=same as, T=Tirthaṅkara, tit tittle, W=wife, Wk=work)

B

C

D

G

H

K

O

P

R

U

V